

THE ROMANIC REVIEW

VOL. I—JANUARY-MARCH, 1910—No. 1

OGIER LE DANOIS AND THE ABBEY OF ST. FARO OF MEAUX

PROFESSOR BÉDIER in his *Légendes épiques*¹ has studied the relation of Ogier le Danois to the abbey of St. Faro of Meaux. He has shown to what a remarkable extent the monks of Meaux were instrumental in the formation of the legend of this epic hero. A romantic story was invented by them to account for his entrance into the abbey. A tale equally romantic was created, relating his rescue of the abbey in which he had become a monk from a horde of invading Saracens. The famous poet of Meaux, Fulcoius, wrote his epitaph in sonorous Latin verse. A magnificent tomb was erected in his memory. His sword, a gigantic one, was for centuries preserved at Meaux as a witness to his greatness.

The question I have here attempted to solve is, What is the origin of the connection of Ogier with this abbey? The work of Becker and particularly of Bédier has made familiar to all readers the practice of the medieval monks of seizing popular legend and ascribing it to one of their number, thereby enhancing the glory of their sanctuaries and attracting pilgrims. Exactly this certainly happened in the case of Ogier. There is no reason to suppose that the historic Carolingian Ogier was buried at Meaux.² It is only in the French tradition, which has been clearly proven to be dependent upon legends furnished by the monks of this abbey, that Meaux is declared to be Ogier's last resting place. In the *Roland* nothing is said of his death. According to the

¹ II, 281 ff.

² Cf. Bédier, *op. cit.*, II, 292.

Pseudo-Turpin (ed. Castets, p. 54) he died at Roncevaux and was buried at Belin, near Bordeaux. According to Albéric des Trois-Fontaines (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS., XXIII, 891) he died at Saint-Patrice in the diocese of Nevers.

The legend of Ogier's death as a monk in the abbey of St. Faro of Meaux is easily traceable to its source in a hagiographic composition, the *Conversio Ogerii Militis*.³ According to this document, first published and discussed by Mabillon, the mighty warrior Ogier, second in the empire to Charlemagne alone, decides to forsake the vanities of life and to spend his remaining days in holy contemplation. He departs from the court, assumes the garb of a pilgrim and wanders about in search of that monastery in which the monks are farthest removed from worldly thoughts. To the end of his pilgrim's staff he attaches straps from which are suspended small balls of iron. He enters monastery after monastery and while the monks are at prayers hurls his staff upon the pavement. Nowhere does he find such intent devotion as in the abbey of St. Faro of Meaux, for there, at the unusual sound, no one is disturbed from his prayers except a small boy, who is promptly punished. Ogier is satisfied and persuades his companion-in-arms Benoit to follow him in his renunciation of the world. Charlemagne, at the prayer of Ogier, gives into the possession of the abbey of St. Faro an abbey at Rez near Meaux and another at Vercelli in Piedmont. The sanctity of the hero is attested by miracles after his death.

With the exception of the mention of the abbeys of Rez and Vercelli all of this story is certainly apocryphal.⁴ The test of the staff with the iron balls is a familiar one and was unquestionably

³ Cf. Bédier, *op. cit.*, II, 288 ff. The *Conversio* has been published in full in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, Oct., XII, 620 ff.; in part in Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum ordinis sancti Benedicti*, saec. IV, pars I, p. 622 ff. (Venice edition.)

⁴ The *Conversio* is a saint's life of the conventional sort. It relates the worldly greatness of the hero, his realization of the vanity of life, his piety and self-chastisement after conversion, his prayer to the king to aid the "fratres famulantes," the miracles operated at his tomb. The composition is full of commonplaces, "moralitates," and borrowings from the gospels. (Compare Zopf, *Das Heiligen-Leben im 10. Jahrhundert*, in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, 1908, heft 1, especially p. 42 ff.)

not invented by an historic Ogier. There can be no doubt but that a monk of Meaux with a desire to glorify his abbey borrowed the story from the legend of Walter of Aquitaine, Otto the Great or some other hero and ascribed it to the French Ogier.

It is to be especially noticed that this story is subjoined to a life of St. Faro and is not an integral part of the work. There are two lives of St. Faro extant, one by Hildegare, bishop of Meaux (855-875), and an anonymous life which seems to be based in part on that of Hildegare.⁵ To which one of these lives the *Conversio* was appended it is impossible to say. It appears in the MSS.⁶ now of one life, now of the other, in all cases, so far as I know, introduced with the words: *Faronis vitae venerandae dignum est subscribere*. It is to be considered a separate work and we cannot with certainty date it farther back than the tenth century, when Mabillon's MS. (now lost) was probably written.⁷

The *Conversio Ogerii* is, then, without question unhistorical and was added to a life of St. Faro at an unknown date. What induced the author to write the *Conversio*, or rather what pretext did he have, for we know that he needed only a pretext to ascribe this fascinating legend to a hero of Meaux? Why did he choose Ogier rather than Naime, Olivier or some other paladin? Mabillon arrived at what seems to be the correct solution of the problem. In the life of St. Faro by Hildegare we find the story of the conversion of a certain Rogier.⁸ This Rogier was a famous

⁵ Mabillon declares so. Hecke, the editor of the anonymous life in the *AA. SS. Boll.*, affirms (p. 596, C) that the anonymous life is as old as that of Hildegare and independent of it. Compare Gröber in *Raccolta D'Ancona*, 1901, pp. 587, 595; Körting in *Zeit. f. Stud. franz. Sp. u. Lit.* XVI, 238; Bertoni in *Rev. Lang. Rom.*, LI, 1908, 45. This matter will probably be decided by Krusch, who, it seems, is preparing a critical edition of the *Vita* of Hildegare for the *Mon. Hist. Germ.* (See Suchier in *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XVIII, 1894, 176.)

⁶ The *Conversio* is found, for instance, appended to the *Vita* of Hildegare in the Douai MS. 838 (see *Anal. Boll.*, XX, p. 389) and in the Brussels MS. 7460 (see *Catal. Codd. Hagiogr. Bibl. Reg. Brux.*, vol. I); to the anonymous life in the lost MS. used by the Bollandists and in the Paris MS., Bibl. Nat. 13763 (see *Catal. Codd. Hagiogr. Lat. Bibl. Lat. Paris.*, III, 201). It exists also separately, e. g. Brussels MSS. 8751-60 and 9578-80 (see *Catal. . . . Brux.* II, 252, 338).

⁷ Cf. Bédier, *op. cit.*, II, 291.

⁸ Italia . . . regio cum plurimos Comites ex primoribus Magnatorum juxta regalem potentiam Regis Chlotharii filii Ludovici Imperatoris cognomento Pio

warrior at the court of Lothaire, king of Italy, son of Louis the Pious. In a battle of a war against the Bulgarians, Rogier finds himself in great peril. He calls upon St. Faro for aid and vows that if God spares him he will leave the world and enter the monastery of St. Faro at Meaux. He is saved and ends his life at Meaux. This account is certainly historically true. It is short and simple and gives a valid reason for Rogier's renunciation of the world. Furthermore, Hildegare expressly states that he frequently heard the story from Rogier's own lips and that he had verified it.

Here we seem to have the source of the *Conversio Ogerii*. A monk, remembering vaguely that he has read or heard the story of the conversion of this great warrior of Lothaire's court, is satisfied with this pretext for attributing to him the legend of the staff with the iron balls. It seems probable that in reading the anonymous life of St. Faro he was shocked at not finding there

olim possedisset; specialius unum novimus ex his ad amorem Dei haereditasse ad dilectionem timoremque justitiae sanctitatem in omnibus quaesisse. Hic enimvero a bonis operibus passim divulgatus claruit de nomine Rotgarius. Ut enim gratia divina occultum mundo non redderet, magnificavit eum in quodam bello, quod Chlotharius superius memoratus exacuit contra Bulgarorum gentem. Ipsius praefati Rotgarii denique relatione frequenti ac probatione operis certum mente tenemus, sicut hoc ordine inferemus. Pugnae siquidem conflictus ex utrisque partibus Francorum ac Bulgarorum provocatus, inter mixtos cuneos adversariorum praefatum Rotgarium sors improvisa attulit, ac de equo fidenti circumseptione resistentium corruere compulit. Cumque telis aculeatis loricae relucantem ad ejus mortem conarentur penetrare, illi ad memoriam invocationis in hoc agone posito accessit solum clarissimi Faronis nomen ex innumerabilibus Sanctorum nominibus. At ipsa momentanea hora voto firmissimo Deo se obligans ut si adesset liberator tantus praestantissimus Confessor, hoc in loco ad serviendum ei spreto malefido saeculo accederet devotissimus debitor; illico huic voto adfuit Divinum auxilium, quo invocatione tanti Confessoris mirabiliter liberatus evasit ab ipsis faucibus crudelissimae mortis inlaesus. Qui postmodum hanc devotionem obligationis libentissime exsecutus, quam laudabiliter pondus hujus abnegaverit saeculi, adhaerendo hoc in loco Religioni Monastici; quam assiduus in orationibus publicis atque furtivis, parcus in cibis, continuus in vigiliis, cotidie etiam intentus in renovandis Confessionum poenitentibus exstiterit, non similem nobis tempora admirantur nostra, nec ad exemplum vix similem aut rarissime largiuntur. Talem ac tantum voluit sibi admirabilis Antistes Dei Faro in longinquis regionibus procurare, qui ad ejus loci excubias curasset vitam Angelicam ad illuminationem multorum ducere.

(Hildegare's Life of St. Faro, ch. CXIX: Mabillon, *AA. SS.* saec. II, p. 595; also in saec. IV, pars I, p. 627; reprinted by Bouquet, *Recueil* etc. VI, 293).

the account of this glorious intervention of the saint, which he remembered indistinctly from the life of Hildegare. So it seemed worth while to him to subjoin the tale (*Faronis . . . vitae . . . dignum est subscribere*). Already in the course of the repetition, either orally or by writing, of the Rogier story the name had perhaps been changed to Ogier and the legend of the staff ascribed to the latter. No great paladin Rogier was known to the monks—there is no great Rogier in epic tradition (see Langlois, *Table des Noms propres dans les Chansons de Geste*, Paris, 1904)—and it was a simple matter advertently or inadvertently to substitute the well-known name *Ogier* for the unknown *Rogier*. Legends certainly existed in regard to *Ogier* at this date (see below).

We come now to the difference in the names. This is very slight and anyone familiar with medieval chronicles and particularly with the transmission of epic traditions will not be surprised to find the names *Ogier* and *Rogier* confused.⁹ Mabillon¹⁰ did

⁹ The forms in Foerstemann's *Altdeutsches Namensbuch*, Bonn, 1900, show that numberless names were pronounced both with and without an initial aspirate. For the name *Ogier* see vol. I, col. 193. Compare the Danish form *Holger*. In the north of France the aspirate of German names was surely distinctly felt at this period. Considering the uncertainty prevailing in Foerstemann there can be no question but that Germanic names, even though they were not originally aspirated, might be provided with an aspirate, particularly in non-germanic territory. This is, of course, especially true of names beginning with the back vowels (see Langlois' *Table* under H, O, U.) In the dialect of Meaux was the pronunciation of initial *r* such as to occasion the confusion of *Hogier* and *Rogier*? Compare the substitution of *r* for initial *h* in certain Norman dialects, e. g. *honte* > *ronte*; cf. also *environs* > *envihons* (see Eurén, *Étude sur FR français*, Diss., Upsala, 1896, pp. 36, 45, and his references to Joret in *Rom.* XII, 594; XIV, 285). This phonetic possibility is not, however, necessary to my argument. An accidental confusion, considering the willingness of the monks to be confused, is sufficient.

Compare with the fall of initial *r* the following analogous cases: the Lombard king *Rachis* is called *Achis* in a list of Lombard kings (see *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS. *Rer. Langobard.* 6.24; *Radoaldi*, var. *Adoaldi*, *ibid.* 116.9; *Rodoald*, var. *Hodoaldus*, *ibid.* 136.22; *Raginpertum*, var. *Aginpertum*, *ibid.* 139.5; *Rhenum*, var. *Henum*, *Hinum*, *ibid.* 178.1; conversely *Ariulf*, var. *Agiulf*, *Ragclulf*, *ibid.* 115.7. The *Rainfroi* of *Berthe au grand Pied* is called *Hainfroi* regularly in the *Mainet* and *Heinfrey* the only time he is mentioned in *Doon de Maience* (see Langlois' *Table*). Assimilation to the name *Heudri* (*Rainfroi's* brother) facilitated the change (cf. Rajna, *Origini*, p. 211, n.). Another *Rainfroi* is called *Hainfroi* in *Huon de Bordeaux* (v. 51, *Hainfrois et Henris*: assimilation here also). That not once in the *chansons de geste* the variant *Rogier* should appear

not hesitate to identify the two on the score of the difference in the names. It was not until he discovered that he was wrong in supposing Ogier to be merely a poetic figure and never to have existed that he was willing to admit the independence of the Rogier of the one *Conversio* and the Ogier of the other. Knowing as we do and as Mabillon did not, that there is no reason to suppose that the historic Ogier died at Meaux, and knowing that the monks of Meaux had every reason to desire in this case to falsify history, we may with comparative certainty return to Mabillon's first conclusion and declare Ogier and Rogier to be one and the same. Nor did Gaston Paris consider a confusion of the names impossible.¹¹ Another great scholar and one thoroughly familiar with the vagaries of medieval scribes apparently admits the possibility of confusion of the two names. In the index to his edition of the epitaphs of Fulcoius of Meaux, Omont prints *Rogierius v. Otgerus*.¹² Barrois,¹³ without suggesting the slightest difficulty in the identification, accepts as the epic Ogier a certain Rogier whose vision of paradise and purgatory Mabillon published in *AA. SS. saec. IV, pars I, pp. 627-8*.

The epic Ogier is once actually called Rogier by Albéric des Trois-Fontaines.¹⁴ This chronicler is well known to have gathered for *Ogier* is not surprising since the name Rogier is almost unknown in the songs (see Langlois' *Table*). Both names are exceedingly common in the historical documents of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries.

¹¹ *AA. SS. II, 595, Note C.*

¹² *Histoire poétique de Charlemagne, p. 307, n. 1.*

¹³ *Mélanges Havet, Paris 1895, p. 211 ff.* This is of course our Ogier. I cannot understand the reason for this introduction of the name *Rogier*. There is no reference to a Rogier in the epitaph of Ogier. In 1894 Suchier published a study of Lothaire's war against the Saxons in the *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.* (XVIII, 175 ff.). He adds (p. 193) a part of Fulcoius' metrical life of St. Faro, which was transcribed for him by Omont. Did Omont find here any reason to suppose that Ogier was sometimes called Rogier in the ecclesiastic writings of Meaux, or does he accept without further evidence the rejected theory of Mabillon which I am attempting to defend?

¹⁴ *La Chevalerie Ogier, Paris, 1842, p. XXVII.* Barrois, who used the Paris edition of Mabillon, prints "t. I, p. 668." He probably meant "saec. IV, pars I, 668." I have not access to the Paris edition but feel sure that the legend referred to by Barrois is the one I have before me in the Venice edition.

¹⁵ *Mon. Germ. Hist. XXIII, 724.14: Qui (i. e. Ferracutus) Rogerium Dacum, Raynaldum de Alaspina, Constantinum, Oellum misit in carcerem (cf. Ogerus rex Daciae, 723.42; rex Ogerus, 723.54; Ogerus, 725.10).* Compare G. Paris, *Histoire poétique, p. 307.*

ered traditions from all sources. Besides the passage referred to he mentions Ogier twice¹⁵ and in each case his statement in regard to our hero is unknown from other sources. So it is evident that the tradition familiar to Albéric was entirely separate from the Meaux tradition. No mention of Meaux is made in Albéric and Ogier is expressly stated to have died and received burial elsewhere. Therefore, we have here a second, entirely independent, case of the confusion of the names *Ogier* and *Rogier*. The passage of Albéric in which Ogier is called *Rogierius Dacus* relates the preliminary battles of Ferragu before his final contest with Roland. The story is familiar and Albéric's source is apparently the *Pseudo-Turpin* (see ch. XVII, ed. Castets). In none of the editions of the *Pseudo-Turpin* is there any trace of a Rogier in the recital of the battle against Ferragu. But in a passage of the Poitevin version (both MSS.), edited by Auracher (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.* I, p. 284), interpolated some pages before the Ferragu episode, we read the following: *De qui ala Ocgiers a Cordis ob .XV. mire Crestiens. Lors eissit Aiguolanz de Cordis ob .CC. mire Sarrazins. E combatet sei ob Ocgier en la vau de Bucirande. E equi fu mors li dux Rainaumes e li dux Rogiers e .II. mire Crestien. Rogiers fu portez a Sainte Sone.*" The Rogier who died here is not Ogier, but a confusion might easily have resulted from a careless reading of this passage, particularly since there is no important Rogier in the French epics, at any rate in those extant. Ogier is not called *li dux Ogiers* in the Poitevin *Pseudo-Turpin*, but the term *dux* is commonly applied in Latin sources to the various personages who are supposed to be the historic prototypes of the epic Ogier.¹⁶ Albéric calls him once *Auctarius dux*. It seems probable that in the version of the *Pseudo-Turpin* used by Albéric the confusion had already been consummated and that in Albéric's mind *Rogierius dux* and *Ogerius dux* were identical.

¹⁵ The *Lotharius superbus* passage quoted below and the following: *A partibus Hispaniarum venit hoc tempore quidam valde senio confectus miles grandævus, qui se dicebat esse Ogerum de Dacia, de quo legitur in Historia Karoli Magni, et quod mater eius fuerit filia Theoderici de Ardenna. Hic itaque obiit hoc anno, ut dicitur, in dyocesi Nivernensi, villa que ad sanctum Patricium dicitur, prout illic tam clerici quam layci qui viderunt tulerunt.* (*Mon. Germ. Hist.* SS. XXIII, 891.46 ff.)

¹⁶ See the sources quoted in Voretzsch, *Ueber die Sage von Ogier dem Dänen*, Halle, 1891, passim.

In any case, the passage in Albéric is an indisputable example of the substitution of the name *Rogier* for the epic *Ogier* and this substitution is independent of the tradition current at Meaux.

A third independent case of the confusion of the two names may be cited, though here there is no thought of the epic *Ogier*. Monaci in his *Crestomazia italiana dei primi Secoli* (Città di Castello, 1889, p. 209) publishes a *canzone* which is found in only one MS. This song is headed *Rugieri Apulghiese*. But in v. 42 the poet calls himself *Ugieri Apulghiesi*.

The proneness of medieval clerics to identify distinct personages is once more exemplified in the case of our *Ogier*. In a necrology of the abbey of St. Faro, dating from the sixteenth century, after the statement *Obierunt Ogerius le Danois et Benedictus Fratres nostrae Congregationis*, the same scribe added that *Ogier* granted to the abbey of St. Faro all his possessions in Charmentray and that, at his prayer, Charlemagne conferred *multa bona* upon the same monastery. The real *Ogier* of Charmentray had nothing but his name in common with the epic *Ogier*. In 1070, persuaded by his sister, a nun, he entered the abbey of St. Faro with his two children and gave all his possessions to the same monastery.¹⁷ The author of the necrology knew only the great *Ogier* and did not hesitate to identify with him another *Ogier* who lived three hundred years later.¹⁸

The abbey of St. Faro is not alone in claiming without reason the epic *Ogier* as one of its attractions. Adalbertus and Occarius, brothers, without much question both historic, founded a monastery at Tegernsee in Bavaria, in the time of Pippin. Occarius was certainly a Bavarian but was confused with the French *Ogier*; and the mere similarity of the names impelled the monks of Tegernsee to identify Occarius and *Ogier*. According to the legend as we find it in the work of Metellus of Tegernsee (about 1160), Occarius

¹⁷ See Mabillon, *AA. SS.*, IV, I, pp. 619-620.

¹⁸ A Saint Autharius (this name is easily confused in the Latin, though of course not in the popular form with *Autharius*, cf. below: *Rotharius*—*Rotcharius*) is mentioned in Hildegare's Life of St. Faro (ch. XIV: Mabillon, *AA. SS.* II, 585). He was apparently a man of importance in the world, was converted, lived in a manner to deserve canonization, and miracles were performed at his grave. It is possible that the story of this Saint Autharius facilitated the confusion of *Ogier* and *Rogier*.

is said to be a duke of the Burgundians whom they extol under the name *Osigerius*. Then is related the disastrous chess game as we have it in the *Chevalerie Ogier*.¹⁹ We find here, therefore, another monastery claiming Ogier on the ground of a similarity in name.

Still a third benefactor of monasteries has, it seems, been identified with the epic Ogier and doubtless here too the inspiration came from a similarity in name. According to a chronicler of the monastery of St. Martin of Cologne, *Olgerus Daniae dux*, with the aid of Charlemagne, in the year 778 restored the monastery after it had been destroyed by the Saxons.²⁰ The *Olgerus* of the MS. may be a scribal error for *Otgerus* or it may be that this was really the name of the noble referred to. At any rate the designation *Daniae dux* shows that he was confused with the epic Ogier.²¹

Remembering that Ogier is called Rogier in one passage of Albéric des Trois-Fontaines, let us consider that most perplexing and much discussed statement of this same chronicler: *Qui Pipinus misit Chrodegangum, sororis sue filium, prius abbatem, post Mettensem episcopum, et Auctarium ducem, qui in cantilena vocatur Lotharius superbus, ut papam adducerent in Franciam*.²² Voretzsch's view (*op. cit.*, p. 109) that we have here a reference to Lothaire's Saxon war is not convincing and is rightly rejected by Becker (*Litblatt.*, 1895, col. 406). Becker thinks that the text is corrupt and that we should read *Otcharius* instead of *Lotharius*. We have one instance of the use of the name *Rogier* for *Ogier* in Albéric. Have we not a second in this passage, and instead of Becker's emendation *Otcharius* ought we not read *Rotharius*? In two cases (there are doubtless more) I have found the variant *Lothari* for *Rothari* (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS. Rer. Langobard., p. 59. 23; p. 509). For the equivalence of *th* and *tch* (*Rotharius*, *Rotcharius*) see the index of this volume of the *Monumenta*. The phonetic change of initial *r* to *l* is exceedingly common in all sorts

¹⁹ See Voretzsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32; 70-77.

²⁰ *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS., II, 214.

²¹ That this *Olgerus* is not the Danish hero (*Holger Danske*) is shown by Voretzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 23 ff.

²² *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS., XXIII, 708.

of words. The denomination *superbus* applied to Ogier is fully in accord with his character as we know it from the *chansons de geste*.

We have no difficulty in identifying the Ogier of the *Conversio* with the epic Ogier. But who is Benoît, who enters the monastery at the same time with Ogier? He is unquestionably the Benoît of the French *chanson de geste* and we are tempted at first to assume that the author of the *Conversio* has simply taken this personage from the poem in its primitive form. But Bédier (*op. cit.*, II, p. 300; cf. Voretzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 62) has presented an objection worthy of consideration. Benoît is not the name of a layman. It is a name frequently assumed on entering a monastery of the Benedictines.²³ What the original name may have been, we have, of course, no means of ascertaining. There were legends current on Ogier's account at this early period (cf., for instance, the story of Desiderius and Ogier on the tower of Pavia as related by the monk of St. Gall²⁴). Ogier may have had a particularly dear companion according to these early legends, but how did he come to be called Benoît? Bédier has found a Benoît, vicomte de Toulouse, who lived at the beginning of the tenth century. It is not impossible that Ogier's companion was actually called Benoît in the legend before it was transformed by the monks of Meaux and that, therefore, neither the hero nor the name was invented at Meaux. Ample confirmation for the conjecture that Benoît played a part in the story before it reached Meaux is found in the *Chevalerie Ogier*. Here Benoît dies on the battle-field near Châteaufort, in southern France or in Italy (v. 8060). Suddenly, at the end of the poem, we are told that he lies beside Ogier in the abbey of St. Faro of Meaux. So it seems probable that according to the early legend Ogier had a companion named Benoît who died at Châteaufort. The monks of Meaux disregarded this legend and declared that he, the inseparable companion of Ogier, entered the abbey with Ogier and died there. A reviser of the old legend related his death in the battle near Châteaufort and then, under the influence of the tradition current at Meaux, not realizing his in-

²³ Compare the cases cited by Bédier, *l. c.*

²⁴ *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, SS., II, 731.

consistency, asserted at the end of the poem that he was buried at Meaux.

Of the whole *Conversio Ogerii* only the mention of the abbeys of Vercelli and Reda seems historical. As Bédier (*op. cit.*, II, p. 292) remarks, the author might easily have gained this information from an obituary or some similar document.²⁵ No record of the abbey of Vercelli could be found by Hecke, the editor of the *Conversio* in the *AA. SS. Boll.* (p. 623 A). The author says it ceased to be the property of St. Faro when Italy was lost to France. Rogier, we know, lived at the Italian court of Lothaire. It is natural that he should have owned land in Italy, whereas it is extremely unlikely that any should have been held by Ogier. Reda is said by the author of the *Conversio* to be a few miles (*stadiorum octoginta*) distant from Meaux. Mabillon (*op. cit.*, p. 624) identifies this Reda with Rez. The author of the *Conversio* may have been mistaken and the place mentioned in his source may have been some other Reda, perhaps in Italy. A Reda in northern Italy is mentioned in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Dipl. Reg.*, II, 802.39, III, 699.35; cf. II, 695.15, III, 330.11. Is there a Reda near Vercelli? I have at hand no means of investigating this question. The abbey in Vercelli had ceased to be the property of St. Faro before the *Conversio Ogerii* was written. If the abbey of Reda was in Italy the same is true also of it. But the author of the *Conversio* identified the Italian Reda with the Reda in the neighborhood of Meaux, which had been long in the possession of his abbey. It is unlikely that the same man should have held land in northern Italy and near Paris. There can be no doubt about

²⁵ The wording of the *Conversio* seems to imply that the author drew his information in regard to the donation from a separate source. *Ubi* (at the abbey of St. Faro) *arma bellica et omnia, quae in saeculo habuerant, votivo corde pro nomine Jesu Christi relinquentes, quamdiu vixerunt, in sancta religione manserunt.* Immediately follows what seems to be an appendix (of course similar gifts are usual): *In eodem vero anno, quo monachi effecti sunt, Ogerius, jam cognoscens monasticas consuetudines ad Carolum regressus est, monens et humiliter ex postulans, ut—S. Faronis monasterium a benefactis non exciperet.* Follows the donation of the abbeys. It is possible that the author is here attempting to validate a disputed claim to Reda by the not unusual means of a forgery; compare, for instance, the quarrel between Aniane and Gellone (see Bédier, *op. cit.*, I, ch. IV.)

the locality of Vercelli. Was not the Reda referred to also in Italy? Vercelli suggests Rogier as the owner of the land granted to the abbey. The author of the *Conversio* ascribes the gift to Ogier, confused with Rogier, just as we have seen the gift of Ogier de Charmentray attributed to the epic Ogier.

BARRY CERF

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

THE SCRIBE OF THE OATHS OF STRASSBURG: WHAT WAS HIS NATIONALITY?

IT is the purpose of this paper to suggest an answer, based on reasons chiefly paleographical, to the query serving as its title. The writer has had at his disposal the plates in G. Paris: *Les plus anciens Monuments de la Langue Française*, 1875, planche I; M. Ennecerus: *Die ältesten deutschen Sprachdenkmäler*, Frankfurt am Main, 1897, Tafeln 34-36; and Steffens: *Lateinische Paläographie, Supplement zur zweiten Auflage*, Freiburg in der Schweiz, 1908, Tafel 31. The latter two collections have been of especial service in this inquiry, for the Ennecerus plates, for example, furnish six whole columns of the complete manuscript; i. e., not only the text of the *Oaths* in the Romance and German versions, but also, what is extremely important for our investigation, the Latin context in which the Romance and German texts are embedded. Few investigations of the *Oaths of Strassburg*, considered in their linguistic and paleographical aspects, have paid attention to the context of these monuments. Still more valuable as a reproduction than the plates of Ennecerus are the splendid photographs of Steffens, and their value is increased by the editor's learned and careful transcription and paleographical annotations.¹

Steffens and other critics, such as Léopold Delisle,² have given brief bibliographical accounts of the unique manuscript which we are considering. For the purpose of this article, it is perhaps sufficient to recall that MS. 9768 *du fonds français*, in the National Library at Paris, was written about 970, and came from the North French monastery of Saint Médard de Soissons, being a copy

¹ That Steffens' work is not free from errors is, however, to be seen in his note on page 1: <saluari> "aus *saluarai*; es scheint wenigstens dass das dritte a durch einen untergesetzten Punkt getilgt ist." The "dot" of which he speaks is not a *punctum delens*, but one of the numerous blotches or possible water stains visible in the photograph of both Steffens' pages.

² This venerable scholar has published some little-known information about the manuscript of Nithardus in his delightful *Souvenirs de Jeunesse*: see the concluding article: *The Library*, London, 1908, pages 245-49.

(direct?) of an original which was more than a century and a quarter older.

Does this most valuable manuscript offer any evidence as to the nationality of the scribe who copied Nithardus' important text?

To answer this question at all adequately, we must observe

1°. That these manuscript pages contain texts in Latin, French and German.

2°. That the language used by a North French scribe would, if he was a native, probably be French in some one of its dialects, or some variety of German; if a foreigner, his language was in all likelihood Anglo-Saxon or Celtic.

3°. That any competent scribe must have had a knowledge of Latin.

4°. That this codex dates from a period when the Frankish or French or Caroline minuscule, sometimes known as the ordinary book-hand of the Middle Ages, had triumphed over other forms of script in France, Germany and England, not to mention its inroads on Beneventan and Visigothic territory. In this period, too, an effort is made to separate the words from one another, though this evolution is hardly complete for another half century. Let us now, by means of Ennecerus' plates, test the copyist's knowledge of Latin. He usually separates his words, and that too, correctly. His mistakes in transcription are not numerous, the worst being the miswriting of *quo* for *qua*: 36 A 10; *que* for *qua*: 36 A 32; the omission or *non* after *nec*: 36 B 29; writing *contigi* for *contingere*. His other errors he has in the main corrected of his own volition, with the result that we have a good Latin text, one not differing materially in our printed copies from that of the codex. One thing which everywhere troubles the scribe is the combination *dh*. He divides it between lines: see 36 A 23-4. His use of the *ç* is not oftener incorrect than that of the average scribe of the time. He employs the sign * (*spiritus asper*) for *h*, as was frequently the custom during this period. On the whole, he was not only a good copyist, but was a competent Latinist.

Now, as to his French. The text, as so many Romance scholars have found, contains a large number of problematical forms, such as: *podir*, *sendra*, *eo*, *eu*, *iu* and *io* from *ego*, *pro* for *por*, *ad iudha*, *a iuha* and *cad huna* (divided thus), etc. Making all due allow-

ance for the difficulties of the original scribe who first wrote down the French *Oaths*—and his task was not an easy one—we cannot believe that the scribe of our manuscript properly copied his original. Nor should we explain many of his apparent blunders so much by his defective paleographical knowledge, as by his comparative ignorance of the French language. In other words we do not believe that the scribe who copied the *Oaths* as we have them in the manuscript of Nithardus was a Frenchman.

If we now pass to the German portion of the text, here is what he actually writes for the first oath (36 B 16–24):

Ingodes minna indinthes xpanes folches
indunser bedhero gel^t nissi. fonthese
moda ge frammordesso framso mirgot
geuuizci indimadh furgibit so haldihtes
an minanbruodher soso manmit rehtu
sinan bruher scal inthi utha zermigso
maduo. in dimit luheren in no^t hein uit
hing nege gango. zhe minan uuillon imo
ces cadhen uuerhen.

These words are printed thus in W. Braune's *Altdeutsches Lesebuch*, 4te Auflage, Halle, 1897, p. 49:

In godes minna ind in thes christiānes folches ind unsêr bêdhero gehaltnissi, fon thesemo dage frammordes, sô fram sô mir got geuuizci indi mahd furgibit, so haldih thesan minan bruodher, sôso man mit rehtu sinan bruodher scal, in thiū thaz er mig sô sama duo, indi mit Ludheren in nohheiniu thing ne gegango, the minan uuillon imo ce scadhen uuerdhên.

The second oath in its German form runs thus (35 A 1–16):

Obâ karl theneid then er sinen obruodher
ludhu uuige gesuor geleistit, indilud
hu uuig minherro thener imo gesuor forbrih
chit. obihinanes iruuen denne mag noh
ih noh theronoh hein the nihes iruundenmag
uuidhar karle imoce follus tine uuiridhit.

In Braune's text this is printed, p. 50:

Oba Karl then eid, then er sinemo bruodher Ludhuuige gesuor, geleistit, indi Ludhuuig min hêrro then er imo gesuor forbrihchit,

ob ih inan es iruuenden ne mag; noh ih noh thero nohhein, then
ih es iruuenden mag, uuidhar Karle imo ce follusti ne uuidhit.

When we consider the fact already mentioned that our scribe divides correctly his Latin words, and when we note the way he divides his German words, we are forced to the conviction that his acquaintance with the latter language was distinctly imperfect. No one who understood German could have given us such confusion as we have here. What scribe of good training, for example, who knew well the German language, could have written at the end of a line: *fonthese*, and, at the beginning of the next line: *moda ge*, when the correct forms were: *fon thesemo dage*? This point appears in its true light when one has the manuscript before him, and notes that the scribe had abundant space at the end of the line to include the final syllable *ge*. Again, note in passing how the scribe has split the digraphs *th* and *dh*. This can only be taken to indicate ignorance of the language. To employ a simple illustration, only the ignorant and uneducated would divide the English *th* between the end and beginning of lines. It is unnecessary to dwell longer on this fact.

If our scribe is only a fair scholar in French and has no great knowledge of German, is there any trace of Celtic in his manuscript? None that we have been able to observe. There are, however, symptoms of the Insular (Anglo-Saxon or Irish) scribal habits, and this seems to us a point of great importance. For example, the reader has already noticed in the French text the singular division of *ad iudha*. These words might serve as samples of the tendency on the part of Anglo-Saxon scribes to divide a compound word into its component parts or what were supposed to be its component parts. One may consult in this connection W. W. Skeat: *Twelve Old English MSS.*, Oxford, 1892, p. 8, and W. Keller: *Angelsächsische Paläographie*, Palæstra, XLIII, i, Berlin, 1906, p. 2.

Are there illustrations of this habit in our Latin text? We find here some forms which might possibly be merely accidental: *pip pino* 34 A 21; and *Pip pinus*, 34 B 12. But we also find such forms as: *bene uola*, 34 A 16; *p humane*, 34 A 17 and 36 B 7; *tra iecit*, 34 A 24; *sub iugare*, 34 A 29 *ludhu uic*, 34 B 6: cf. 15-16 and 27; *inī ea*, 34 B 14, and 36 A 31; *ad inuare*, 35 A 6: *ad iutorio*,

29; *con uenimus*, 35 A 23; *cō ui uia*, 36 B 5; *cō ui uii*, 8, and *cō munia*, 9. Other examples might be cited, but these are the most striking. The case of *gelu*, 36 A 15, may be mentioned as illustrating another Insular habit, namely, the doubling of consonants after a short vowel.

But our evidence has not yet all been cited, for there is a letter which shows a wonderful conservation and power of resistance—*N*. The Merovingian majuscule hand of the eighth century often has *F* for *N*, but it is only the Insular *F* which can provide us with the precedent for the forms of *N* occurring in 35 A 3 and 17, and 36 A 17, no one of which is an initial of a sentence. This is a point of the utmost importance in determining the nationality of our scribe.

Still another habit usual among both Irish and English scribes, is that of grouping together words united in pronunciation under a single utterance of accent, *e. g.*, in the first French Oath, *sisaluaræio*. For this trait in Old Irish, see J. Vendryes: *Grammaire du vieil-irlandais*, Paris, 1908, § 582–98, where examples and the literature of the subject will be found, and Thurneysen: *Handbuch des altirischen*, I Teil, Heidelberg, 1909, § 32. For Old English, see Keller, *l. c.*, p. 51.

The writer believes that the facts and considerations here adduced justify the conclusion that the scribe who copied the *Oaths of Strassburg* was, or had been, under Insular (and probably Anglo-Saxon) influence, if not actually an English monk. He may have used the Insular hand in his earlier days, and then, learning later the ordinary minuscule so much clearer to read and easier to write, he may have adopted it, but may have found it unadvisable or impossible to divest himself entirely of his acquired habits.

JOHN M. BURNAM

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

THE PROBLEM OF THE "LONZA," WITH AN UNPUBLISHED TEXT.

THE famous "three beasts"—*lonza, leone, lupa*—which Dante mentions in the first canto of the *Inferno* have already caused so much discussion, mostly profitless, that one may well hesitate before adding to the bibliography of the subject—unless, indeed, one is able to bring forward some really new material. In particular, the identity and the symbolism of the *lonza* have challenged ingenuity. As usual, the older commentators are in substantial agreement; the word *lonza* was evidently no stumbling-block to them, and with one or two exceptions they interpret the three beasts as symbols respectively of lust, pride and avarice. Let us take Boccaccio as the type (*Comento*, ed. Milanese, p. 173):

Dice adunque . . . essere state tre bestie quelle che il suo salire impedivano, una leonza, o lonza che si dica, e un leone e una lupa; le quali quantunque a molti e diversi vizj adattare si potessono, nondimeno qui, secondo la sentenza di tutti, par che si debbano intendere per questi, cioè per la lonza, il vizio della lussuria, e per lo leone, il vizio della superbia, e per la lupa, il vizio dell' avarizia. E perciocchè io non intendo di partirmi dal parere generale di tutti gli altri, verrò a dimostrare come questi animali a' detti vizj si possono appropriare.

While agreeing in the traditional views as to the lion and the wolf, for the *lonza* the significance of *vanagloria* was suggested by Jacopo della Lana, and of *invidia*, envy, by Castelvetro. This latter interpretation and in general the principle that the three beasts stand for three particular sins, has recently been stoutly defended by D'Ovidio,¹ who at the same time does not exclude the possibility that Dante had political as well as allegorical significations in mind.

¹ *Le tre fiere*, in *Studi sulla Divina Commedia*, Milano, 1901, pp. 302-325, 585-7. The same view is held by G. Lajolo, *Simboli ed enigmi danteschi*, Roma, 1906; and by D. Guerri in his review of Lajolo in *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, XIV, 9-17. The significance *vanagloria* has recently been defended by L. Raffaele, *La Corda di Dante*, in *Giornale Dantesco*, XIV, 97-106. Evidently the *corda* of *Inf.*, XVI has some bearing on the problem of the *lonza*, but it is such a troublesome problem itself, that I do not discuss it here.

On the other hand, Torraca in his commentary on the *Divina Commedia* (1905) accepts *lussuria* and *avarizia*, but proposes *gola*, gluttony, for the lion. An entirely different interpretation is now in favor with many scholars, who, however, differ among themselves as to details. The essence of this is in making the three beasts stand, not for three particular sins, but for the classes of sin in the *Inferno*. This idea was first proposed by G. Casella,² who, identifying the *selva selvaggia* with the *Inferno*, made the wolf stand for sins of incontinence, the lion for those of violence, the *lonza* for those of fraud. P. Chistoni³ defends this view, and further identifies the *lonza* with Gerione (*Inf.* xvii). F. Flamini⁴ adopts the same general system, but with a distinction that he regards as very important: the three beasts are not the categories of sin, but the forms of evil disposition which lead to sin—the *lonza* is *la malizia*, the lion *la malizia bestiale* or *bestialità*, the wolf *l'incontinenza*. G. Pascoli,⁵ in order to have the symbol of the lighter sins come first, proposes to invert this order, and make the *lonza* stand for incontinence, which agrees fairly well with the traditional view. Naturally, all these different theories, and various others that might be mentioned,⁶ are defended by their sponsors with weighty and plausible arguments; but many a bewildered reader has doubtless followed with relief those modern scholars who still accept the simple interpretation of the early commentators.⁷

² *Canto a Dante Alighieri con un discorso intorno alla forma allegorica e alla principale allegoria della Div. Com.*, Firenze, 1865, pp. 28-36.

³ *La lonza dantesca*, in *Miscellanea di Studi critici edita in onore di A. Graf*, Bergamo, 1903, pp. 817-48.

⁴ *I Significati reconditi della Commedia di Dante e il suo fine supremo*, Livorno, 1903-4, parte II, pp. 115-49. C. H. Grandgent, in his edition of the *Inferno*, Boston, 1909, p. 9, follows Flamini.

⁵ *Sotto il Velame*. See D'Ovidio, *op. cit.*, p. 311; Flamini, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

⁶ An interesting table of the interpretations of the canto is given by G. G. Warren, Lord Vernon, in his edition of the *Inferno*, London, 1858, pp. xliii-lv. For more recent suggestions, see *Bullettino della Soc. Dant. Ital.*, XIV, 143-5.

⁷ "Concludo adunque che non vi è alcuna seria ragione di abbandonare la comune interpretazione degli antichi."—Casini, *Aneddoti e studi danteschi*, Città di Castello, 1895, pp. 51-9; cf. his commentary on *Inf.* I in the *Lectura Dantis* (1905). Scartazzini at one time made the three beasts stand for *incredulità*, *superbia*, *falsa dottrina* (*Prolegomeni della Div. Com.*, 1890, p. 473; cf. *Dante Handbuch*, 1892, p. 450); but he returned to the traditional view later (*Enciclopedia Dantesca*, 1896, p. 1152; second Leipzig edition of the *Inferno*, 1900). The present writer, in reviewing (*Modern Language Notes*, April,

Not incompatible with the allegorical and ethical symbolism of the canto is the political, which is associated with the name of Gabriele Rossetti, although suggested before him by Dionisi and Marchetti.⁸ Many of the writers referred to above expressly admit that the three beasts may be at the same time both ethical and political symbols. Thus if in Dante's mind lustfulness, or incontinence, or fraudulent dealing, was characteristic of the Florentines of his day, there is no reason why

Una lonza leggiera e presta molto,
Che di pel maculato era coperta,

should not represent simultaneously the sin and the city. Similarly, the lion may stand for the sin of pride, and for the haughty King of France; while the appropriateness of the wolf as a symbol not merely of avarice but of the avarice of Rome, is sufficiently evident. Rossetti, however, denies the propriety of the double symbolism, and in particular denies the appropriateness of the *lonza*, whatever animal may be indicated by this name, as a symbol of lust:

Nessun naturalista ha mai appropriato alla Lonza una tal caratteristica lascivia che la distingua da altri animali . . . ed in vero a nessun de' tanti commentatori eruditissimi, che han seminato di citazioni le lor carte, è bastato l' animo di rapportare un' antica o moderna autorità intorno a questa pretesa lascivia della Lonza; e l' avrebbero sicuramente fatto ove l' avesser potuto.⁹

The argument certainly has some force. Several commentators declare that the *lonza* is lustful, as Boccaccio; "La lonza, la quale è di sua natura lussoriosissimo animale;" Vellutello: "La Leonza, noi la intendiamo per il Leopardo, per esser tra gl'animali che hanno maculato il pelo il più libidinoso." These assertions are not, however, supported by citation of definite statements from authorities, and Rossetti's challenge has gone unanswered. The chief purpose of the present paper is to present an unpublished description of the animal in question, which reads as follows:

1903) Holbrook, *Dante and the Animal Kingdom*, New York, 1902, expressed a preference for D'Ovidio's view, while Holbrook (chap. viii) advanced various arguments in support of the traditional interpretation; new evidence has modified the critic's views on this point.

⁸ See Gabriele Rossetti, *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri con commento analitico*, Londra, 1826, Vol. I, p. 19.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. lxxiv.

Dela natura e dela figura et della propieta dela Loncia.

Loncia e animale molto crudele e fiera, e nasce de coniugimento carnale de leone con lonça ouero de leopardo con leonissa, e cussi nasce lo leopardo. La lonça sempre sta in calura d'amore et in desiderio carnale, launde sua fereçça e molto grandissima. Et naturalmente lo leopardo e la lonça quando amontano l'altre bestie se al terço ouero al quarto salto non prendeno, per grande dispetto et disdegno piu la preda non seguisceno ma lassano andare, e lui remane per corruccio patendo e sufferendo grande fame, de fine tanto che uenne loro facto de prendere la preda in fine al terço o al quarto salto. Quando auiene che prendeno alcuno uenenofo cibo curase e purgase collo stercho del homo, vnde la cacciatore loro engannano in cotal guisa, cioe che quello portano in uno uasello et appendolo ad uno arbore, si che li dicti animali li uegono e allora li dicti cacciatori li assaglie e uccide. Auene ancora che quando questi animali amala d'alcuna enfirmita, curase con sangue de capra saluatica, lo quale beue e con questo guariscone.

This text is found in two manuscripts of the Italian bestiary; one (Par), in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Ital. 450, f. 33 b); the other (Ch), in the Chigi Library at Rome (f. 29 b). It is given here exactly as it reads in Par, except that punctuation is used and abbreviations are solved. The variants of Ch, except for the insertion of a few words near the end of the chapter, are merely orthographical; the most important is the spelling *lonza* instead of *loncia*.¹⁰ In 1905, after a brief study of the Paris manuscript, I published a description of it, with table of contents and copious bibliographical references, in an article on Italian bestiary manuscripts.¹¹ Since then I have collected considerable additional material, and in collaboration with my colleague Dr. M. S. Garver, who has made a complete copy of Par, I hope to publish soon a critical text of the bestiary. In the meantime, a few remarks will make clear the importance of this chapter in connection with the problem of Dante's *lonza*.

¹⁰ Instead of *de fine tanto che venne loro facto*, Ch has: *in fin a tanto che uiene loro facto*; instead of *curase e purgase*, *curansi et purgansi*; instead of *la cacciatore, li cacciatori*; instead of *curase con sangue*, *curanosì e guarisconosi luno al altro con sangue*; etc.

¹¹ *Unpublished Manuscripts of Italian Bestiaries*, in *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn. of America*, XX, pp. 380-433. This paper presupposes acquaintance with Goldstaub und Wendriner, *Ein Tosco-Venezianischer Bestiarius*, Halle, 1892, which gives a Venetian version of the text; and Lauchert, *Geschichte des Physiologus*, Strassburg, 1889.

The essential elements of the problem, as already mentioned, are the identity of the animal indicated by the word *lonza* (which I have purposely refrained from translating); incidentally, the etymology of this word; and finally, the symbolic meaning of the animal. Obviously, a chapter on the *lonza* in a bestiary that Dante might have known, would be of the greatest value; but except in the case of the text now presented, no bestiary contains such a chapter. The manuscripts, Par and Ch, are of the fourteenth century, and too late to have been used by Dante; but there is good reason to believe that the lost archetype of the dozen or more extant manuscripts containing the Italian bestiary was written in the thirteenth century.¹² All the manuscripts have in common a number of bestiary chapters, and the majority of them also contain a collection of fables. In Par and Ch there is a third part, not found elsewhere,—several chapters on lions, then *leonesa*, *leopardo*, *loncia* (*lonza*), *artalupo*, *urso*, *lupo*, *lupa*, etc. This third part evidently did not belong to the archetype; at what time, and from what sources, it was added to the bestiary, I cannot say. At any rate, it gives standing to the *lonza* as a bestiary animal, with definite characteristics; and these characteristics, it will be at once noted, are in striking harmony with Dante's epithets *leggera e presta molto*, while the evidence, so far as it goes, supports the interpretation of the symbolism as "lustfulness," without a suggestion of "fraud" or "envy." Whether or not Dante was, as seems probable, familiar with a traditional description of the *lonza*, it is scarcely possible that our bestiary text was influenced by Dante. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the early commentators were influenced by the bestiary. At any rate, the existence of the bestiary description strengthens the presumption in favor of the traditional interpretation.

The next thing to note is that in the added chapters of Par and Ch occur three pairs of animals, each pair including one of Dante's three beasts—lion and lioness, wolf and she-wolf, *leopardo* and *lonza*. This at once suggests the idea, confirmed by the statement about the parentage of both beasts, that the writer of our text, at

¹² See my article already cited, pp. 384-5; and M. S. Garver, *Sources of the beast similes in the Italian lyric of the thirteenth century*, in *Romanische Forschungen*, XXI, pp. 309-20.

least, regarded the *lonza* as a female leopard. Like the *lonza*, the leopard is not regularly a bestial animal; he does occur, however, in several animal-books, with the characteristics here ascribed to his mate. Different characteristics are given in the preceding chapter of Par (f. 33a), and Ch (f. 29a), which begins as follows:

Leopardo e bellissima bestia del quale se notano principalmente due nature. La prima ch'ella e una de le piu ingegnoso animale che sia. La seconda che in se a legerezza grandissima. Trovase probabilmente che lo suo ingegno vince e confonde lo leone, ecc.

All the characteristics ascribed to both animals in these two chapters are found in a chapter *De Leopardo* in Bartholomeus Anglicus, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, and some of them again *De pardo*.¹³ A part of this lore apparently comes from Isidore of Seville (*Etymologiarum*, lib. XII, cap. ii, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 82):

Pardus secundus post pantherem est, genus varium et velocissimum, et præceps ad sanguinem. Saltu enim ad mortem ruit. Leopardus ex adulterio leænæ et pardi nascitur, et tertiam originem efficit, sicut et Plinius in naturali historia dicit leonem cum parda, aut pardum cum leænâ concumbere, et ex utroque coitu degeneres partus creari.

Pliny does in fact make a statement something like this (*Nat. Hist.*, lib. VIII, cap. xvi); but the story grows by repetition. The leopard's habit of making only a limited number of jumps after its prey is mentioned by many medieval writers, in Latin, German and

¹³ Edition of 1492, lib. X.VIII, cap. 65: Leopardus est bestia sevissima de leonis et pardi adulteria generata . . . Est et femina major et crudelior quam sit masculus . . . Colorem habet varium sicut pardus. Saliendo non currendo insequitur predam, et si in tercio saltu predam non rapit vel in quarto per indignatione sistit et quasi victus retrocedit . . . [Here follows an account of how the leopard deceives the lion] . . . Quando comedit aliquid venenosum et tunc querit stercus hominis et comedit ipsum. Et ideo venatores fimum illum in vase aliquo suspendunt super arborem, et cum venit leopardus ad arborem saltat ut accipiat stercus et interim ipsum interficiunt venatores . . . Leopardus quando egrotat sanguinem capre agrestis bibit, et sic inde languores evadit . . . Cap. 81. Pardus ut dicitur est bestia velocissima colore vario orbiculata, præceps ad sanguinem, et saltu ruit in mortem. Et habet talem dispositionem sicut panthera, nec habet ab eo aliquam differentiam nisi quam panthera habet maculas albiores . . . Est autem animal libidinosum, et coit cum leena ex cuius adulterio generatur leopardus.

Italian;¹⁴ the number of jumps and the application of the story vary. Cecco d' Ascoli has this stanza on the subject:

Da leonessa il leopardo nasce,
O se leone giace con leoparda,
È nudo di pietà, quando s'irasce,
Si sdegna, se non prende quattro salti,
E per vergogna in terra fisso guarda,
Pensando sdegna dell' ovil gli assalti.

Similarly, Luigi Pulci (*Morgante*, XIV, 75):

Il leopardo pareva sdegnato,
Perch' e' non prese in tre salti la preda;

and a few lines further on, in the same list of animals decorating the pavilion, Pulci mentions (stanza 81):

La lonza maculata e la pantera.

A poet of the thirteenth century, Fredi da Lucca, refers to the deception of the lion by the leopard:

Fui miso in giuoco e frastenuto im pianto,
Sí falssamente m' ingannò lo sguardo,
Sí come lo leone lo leopardo
C' a tradimento li lieva lo manto.¹⁵

Another poet, Folgore da San Gimignano, refers to the quality of swiftness:

Leggero più che lonza o liopardo.¹⁶

Evidently, then, the word *lonza* was sometimes, if not always, used for the leopardess. Its etymology is still disputed, some deriving it from an adjective *leonteia* or *leontia*, "lionlike;"¹⁷ more

¹⁴ See Goldstaub u. Wendriner, *op. cit.*, p. 203; Lauchert, *op. cit.*, p. 180; G. Ulrich, *Trattati Religiosi e Libro de li Exempla*, Bologna, 1891, p. 108 (no. 23); Cecco d'Ascoli, *L'Acerba*, Venezia, 1820, lib. III, cap. 40.

¹⁵ *Il Libro de varie romanze volgare*, Cod. Vat. 3793, Società Filologica Romana, no. 98 (anon.); *Poeti del Primo Secolo*, Firenze, 1816, II, 221; cf. Garver, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

¹⁶ *Le Rime di Folgore da S. G.*, ed. Navone, Bologna, 1880, no. XV; *Poeti del Primo Secolo*, II, 186.

¹⁷ See Casini, *Aned. e St. Dant.*, pp. 51-9; Chistoni, *La Lonza dantesca*, p. 818; Lajolo, *Simboli ed Enigmi Danteschi*, pp. 21-8.

probably it is the popular derivative, through *lynxia* or *lunceia*, of the Greek and Latin *lynx*, of which the direct derivative is *lince*.¹⁸ In French the initial has been transformed into an article, and we have *l'once*, whence English *ounce*. Once, at least, we have the form without *l* in Italian (*Proverbia que dicuntur super natura feminarum*, ed. Tobler, *Zeitsch. f. Rom. Philol.*, IX, p. 314, stanza 116):

La onça e una bestia mala e perigolosa;
Cercare poi lo segolo, no troui peçor cosa;
D' ognunca creatura este contrariosa,
Non faria una mestega, quanti in terra posa.

Beside the forms already noted—*lonza*, *leonza*, *loncia*—we find in Italian *lonze* (sg.), *lonça*, *lionza*, *lionça*, *leonça*;¹⁹ in Latin *leuncia*

¹⁸ See D'Ovidio, *Studii sulla Div. Com.*, pp. 320, 585 (where he says that the form to be expected would be *loncia*,—exactly the form of our ms. Par); D. Guerri, in *Bullettino della Soc. Dant. Ital.*, XIV, 9; Wiese, *Altitalienisches Elementarbuch*, pp. 23, 75; Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatica Italiana*, Torino, 1901, pp. 27, 119; Körting, *Lat.-Rom. Wb.*; etc.

¹⁹ Cf. in Moore, *Textual Criticism of the Div. Com.*, the ms. variants for *Inf.*, I, 32. Also Lessona, *Gli Animali nella Div. Com.*, Torino, 1893, p. 9. The dictionary of Tommaseo and Bellini quotes from Marco Polo: e sì v' ha lonze e liopardi assai; and from Boccaccio's *Ameto*: Ciascuna dolente lonza. Further instances of the word from the 13th century: Pallamidesse di Firenze (Cod. Vat. 3793, edition cited, no. 188; also in Monaci, *Crestomasia ital.*, p. 251):

Ché, s' una lonze fosse,
sì perderia natura
ed avriane pietanza.

Rustico di Filippo (Cod. Vat., no. 860; ed. Federici, Bergamo, 1899, no. 48):

e di leonza e d' altro assai fragore;

(Cod. Vat., no. 927; mentioned by Casini, *Un poeta umorista del secolo decimotercio*, in *Nuova Antologia*, vol. 109, Feb., 1890, p. 502, as showing that the Florentines associated this and other beasts with human defects):

Ché ci à una lonza sì fiera ed ardità
che se Carlo sapesse i suo comfìni
e de la sua prodeza avesse udita,
tosto n' andrebe sopra i Saracini.
Ma chi è questa lonza, or lo saccate;
Panicia egli è . . .

The so-called *Detto del Gatto Lupesco* (line 127, in Monaci, *Crestomasia*, pp. 449-50):

(Florentine document quoted by Casini, *op. cit.*, p. 53), *lonza* (quoted by Du Cange: *hyænas, quas vulgus vocat lonzas, leone velociore et audaciores*), *lonzanus* (Du Cange, quoting Jacques de Vitry), *lontia* (Benvenuto da Imola), *uncia* (Gesner, *Icones Animalium quadrupedum*, Tiguri, 1560, p. 68, equivalent to Ital. *lonza*, German *Ein Untz oder Kleiner Leppard*; cf. Topsell, *The Historie of Foure-footed Beastes*, London, 1607, p. 568—ounce, "which many in Italy, France and Germany cal *Leunza*, and some *Vnzia*"). *Leonza* was doubtless due to influence of *leone* (cf. *leo-fante*, and what is said below about *leopardus*). Except in quotations from Dante, the use of the word is prevailingly if not exclusively Tuscan.²⁰

As to the identity of the animal in question, the lynx, the panther and the leopard have been proposed. Modern naturalists apply the words panther and leopard to the same species, *Felis pardus*, and in some cases make no distinction between them; the American panther or jaguar, which is not spotted, is a distinct species, *Felis onca*. The snow-leopard or ounce, *Felis uncia*, is a comparatively rare animal from the highlands of central Asia. The lynx, also belonging to the *Felidæ*, is sometimes called *Felis lynx*, and sometimes ascribed to a distinct genus, and called *Lynx lynx*. But in studying medieval literature the modern classifications are as apt to mislead a non-specialist as they are to help him, even if he can reconcile the conflicting statements of naturalists. In fact, it is notoriously difficult to identify the animals mentioned by old writers.²¹ Let us, then, turn our attention to the medieval authorities.

As is well known, certain qualities were attached to certain animal-names. Bartholomeus Anglicus and other writers regarded

E sì vi vidi lo tigro e l tasso
e una lonça e un tinasso.

Of course, Dante mentions the *lonza* of *Inf.*, I, a second time, *Inf.*, XVI, 108:

Prender la lonza alla pelle dipinta.

²⁰ There is another word *lonza* < *lumbea* (see Flechia in *Arch. Glottologico*, II, 361) used by Dante in one of the sonnets to Forese Donati.

²¹ Cf. C. R. Eastman, *Recent Literature on ancient animal names and effigies*, in *American Journal of Philology*, XXX, 322-31; and F. E. Beddard, *Mammalia* (*Cambridge Natural History*, X), London, 1902, 395-7.

the panther and the pard as almost identical, and some said that the panther was the female of the pard. Yet no medieval writer would have applied to the pard the chief quality which the panther has in the original Physiologus and in nearly every bestiary and encyclopedia,—its fragrant breath. The leopard, not regularly a bestiary animal, was regarded as a hybrid like his name, which is not found earlier than about the fourth century; although Pliny speaks of intercourse between the lion and other beasts in the same way in which later writers discuss the origin of the leopard.²² As to the lynx, etymologically it is the ancestor of the *lonsa*; in spite of this fact, however, the connection was absolutely broken.²³ The lynx was joined to the wolf family, preserving from ancient times his proverbial keen sight and other faculties, mentioned by Pliny,—chiefly the function of producing a valuable stone which through envy he hides from men. Isidore of Seville (*Etymol.*, XII, 2) gives this description:

Lynx dictus, quia in luporum genere numeratur: bestia maculis terga distincta, ut pardus, sed similis lupo . . . Hujus urinam converti in duritiam pretiosi lapidis dicunt, qui lincurius appellatur . . . egestum liquorem arenis, in quantum potuerint, contegunt, invidia quadam naturæ, ne talis egestio transeat in usum humanum. (Cf. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, VIII, xxxviii.)

This becomes in the old Italian version of Brunetto Latini, *Il Tesoro* (ed. Gaiter, Bologna, 1877; lib. V, cap. 57):

Un' altra maniera di lupi sono, che si chiamano cervieri, che sono taccati di nero come leonza [French original: *comme l' once*], ed in altre cose sono simiglianti al lupo. E hanno sì chiara veduta, che li loro occhi passano li monti e li muri . . . E dicono quelli che gli hanno veduti, che del suo piscio nasce una pietra preziosa che si chiama ligures. E questo cognosce bene la bestia medesima, secondo che gli uomini l' hanno veduto coprire col sabbione la sua orina, per una invidia di natura, che cotal pietra non vegna a mano d' uomo.

²² Bochart, *Hieroicoicon*, Lugduni Batav., 1712, lib. III, cap. vii, speaks of *panthera* as *pardi femina*; cap. viii, declares that *leopardus* is none other than *pardus*, and that the hybrid origin is a fable; also quotes from Ambrosius: *Leopardus capræ agrestis sanguinem bibit et vim languoris evitat*. Bochart regards the lynx as similar to the panther rather than to the wolf, thus differing from the older writers.

²³ Holbrook, *op. cit.*, p. 100, mentions isolated exceptions.

Bartholomeus Anglicus (cap. 67) repeats Isidore's statements in slightly different wording:

Lynx . . . est autem bestia similis lupo dorsum habens maculis distinctum sicut pardus, vrina eius convertitur in gemmam preciosam, etc.

This passage is thus translated by Vivaldo Belcalzer of Mantua (see V. Cian, *V. Belcalzer e l' enciclopedia italiano*, in *Giornale Storico*, Suppl. no. 4, 1902, p. 124):

Lof cerver è bestia simel al lof, abiant la pel oculà de macule partide a mod de pard, ecc.

The important thing to note in these passages is that *pardus* is translated *l' once*, *leonsa*, and that the lynx is compared to this animal with the clear implication that they are not the same.²⁴ This is absolute proof, it seems to me, in connection with what has gone before, first, that when he said *lonza* Dante did not mean "lynx," and secondly, that the significance of the *lonza* is not "envy." Dante probably did not suspect the etymology of *lonza*; if he had meant lynx, he could have said *lince*—a perfectly comprehensible word, and preserving the alliteration equally well. But his description gives no hint of the well-known characteristics of the lynx, which was commonly called *lupo cerviero*; and the mere fact of its being closely allied to his third beast, *lupa*, would have rendered such a choice less suitable. Further arguments and abundant references are given in an erudite article by E. Proto, who identifies the *lonza* as the female of the *pardo*, or, in other words, as the panther. I prefer to distinguish between pard and leopard, leaving to the panther its well-known traditional characteristics, and calling the *lonza* "leopardess." Still, the distinction was probably not commonly made, and all these animals were surely often confused with one another. As to the symbolism, Proto makes the *lonza* stand for *concupiscentia carnis*.²⁵

²⁴ So far as Brunetto is concerned, this was pointed out by Casini, *Aned. e St. Dant.*, l. c. The three beasts of Jeremiah V, 6—*leo*, *lupus*, *pardus*, confirm my argument. Cf. E. Proto, *La Lonza Dantesca*, in *Giornale Dantesco*, XV, 1-15.

²⁵ *La Lonza Dantesca*, already cited. The opposite view has been strenuously maintained. See D'Ovidio, *op. cit.*; Cipolla, in *Rassegna Bibliografica*, III, 103, cf. 139, 203; and an interesting article by C. B. Cayley, *Dante's "Lonza"*, in *Notes and Queries*, 3d Series, Vol. XII (1867), p. 410 (cf. p. 514). Cayley makes the lynx-lonza stand for gluttony and lust of the flesh, also for Florence.

It seems no more likely that the beast now called "ounce" was indicated by the name *lonza*; this beast seems to have usurped the name in comparatively recent times. Some otl variety of leopard than the ordinary one may have been known, as the cheetah or hunting leopard,²⁶ a less dangerous beast. But in this case we still have the leopard, an animal mentioned in the Bible as fierce (*Is.* XI, 6; *Hos.* XIII, 7), swift (*Hab.* I, 8), spotted (*Jer.* XIII, 23), and used as a type of a kingdom in Daniel's vision (*Dan.* VII, 6). And as a final piece of evidence in favor of identifying *lonza* as a Tuscan word for *leopard* we have the frequently quoted statement of Benvenuto da Imola (*Comentum*, Florentiae, 1887, I, p. 35) in reply to his question "quæ fera sit ista lontia:"

Credo tamen quod autor potius intelligat hic de pardo, quam de aliis, tum quia proprietates pardi magis videmur convenire luxuriæ, ut patet ex dictis, tum quia istud vocabulum florentinum *lonza* videtur magis importare pardum quam aliam feram. Unde, dum semel portaretur quidam pardus per Florentiam pueri concurrentes clamabant: vide lonciam, ut mihi narrabat suavissimus Boccattius de Certaldo.

A document of 1285 speaks of a place in Florence "in quo morabatur leuncia,"²⁷ and this *lonza* Dante doubtless saw.

It may seem to some readers that too much has been made of a bestiary chapter in two manuscripts which are later than Dante; but it seems to me that this testimony is valuable, when taken in connection with the other material, largely familiar, which is here presented. I hope to have demonstrated that by *lonza* Dante meant a "leopardess," and that symbolically this beast could not stand for "envy," while the presumption in favor of the traditional interpretation as "lust" has been considerably strengthened. I have not, of course, gone into the many aspects of the discussion that has arisen over this problem, and I have ignored many arguments. Those who hold the view that the three beasts represent the divisions of Hell may say that the discussion as to envy and lust is irrel-

²⁶ Petrarch alludes to hunting with leopards, *Trionfo di Pudicitia*, 37-9.

Non corse mai sì levemente al varco
D' una fugace cerva un leopardo
Libero in selva, o di catene scarco.

²⁷ See Casini, *l. c.*

evant. Still, even so, the elimination of envy is not unimportant; and many scholars hold the view that the *selva selvaggia* is not a foretaste of Hell with its classifications, but is a figure of the life of this world where individual sins are more in evidence. The temptation to see a parallel between the three beasts and the words of Ciacco (*Inf.*, VI, 74) and Brunetto (*Inf.*, XV, 68) is great; but in these cases the words apply definitely to Florence, not to human life in general nor to Dante's personal life. But are the beasts to symbolize Dante's personal sins, or sins of others which impeded his way? On these and similar questions I hope to have presented a modicum of new evidence; and I trust that the discussion will not seem useless either to those who, with Flamini, regard the forest and the beasts as the corner-stone of Dante's allegorical system, or to those who, with D' Ovidio, regard the first canto rather as a collection of more or less important problems.

KENNETH MCKENZIE

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE FRENCH LOCUTION *A LA QUEUE LEU LEU*

A *LA queue leu leu* is a locution of frequent occurrence in Old and in Modern French, now, however, restricted in its application to a peculiar form of student merrymaking known also as the "monôme"¹ in France, and in America as the "snake" or "serpentine." It refers to the long, winding procession of students who march in single file, hand on shoulder, in celebration of some athletic victory or other college festivity. The French have, too, a children's game called by this same name which will be discussed later.

¹ Cf. Albert-Levy et G. Pinet, *L'Argot de FX*, Paris, 1894, p. 201. "Le monôme est une transformation de la danse antique, appelée la *grue*, qui figure sur le bouclier d'Achille et dans laquelle, à l'imitation de ces oiseaux volant l'un derrière l'autre en longues files, les danseurs se tenaient par la main, et décrivaient, guidés par le conducteur du chœur, des circonvolutions gracieuses.

Quand les compositions écrites pour l'admission à l'Ecole (*Polytechnique*) sont terminées, les *taupins*, candidats des lycées et des écoles préparatoires, se réunissent sur la Place du Panthéon. Ils s'organisent en longue file indienne, chacun venant appuyer ses mains sur les épaules du camarade qui le précède, et partent processionnellement sous la conduite du *premier taupin de France*, le premier de ceux qui ont échoué l'année précédente. Ce gigantesque mille pattes, va, vient, serpente, frappant le sol en cadence, lançant dans les airs des chansons du caractère le plus profane . . . Il se dirige vers la Cour du Collège de France où doivent commencer, quelques jours après, les examens oraux; il décrit toutes les circonvolutions de la courbe qui a fait le sujet de la composition de mathématiques; puis il descend le boulevard, au milieu de la foule ahurie, interceptant la circulation, suit les quais jusqu'au terre-plein du Pont-Neuf et après une ronde échevelée autour de la statue de Henri IV, se rend chez la 'mère Moreau,' le fameux débit de prunes et de chinois. . . Quand on veut faire une manifestation quand il y a du bruit et du tapage, au commencement et à la fin de certains exercices, à des jours désignés et traditionnels, vite un *monôme* s'organise. Le *monôme des fumistes* conduit par un conscrit non encore habillé; le *monôme des tangentes*, le jour où l'on exerce pour la première fois les élèves à se servir de l'épée; le *monôme des manip*s où chacun a revêtu la longue blouse de toile pour la première manipulation de chimie; le *monôme de la gymn*, où l'on arbore pour la première fois le costume de gymnasiarque; le *monôme de l'acide benzoïque*, le jour où l'on prépare cette acide etc. etc.

Monôme, dinôme, trinôme, ces mots qu'emploie l'algèbre pour désigner une expression d'un, de deux ou bien de trois termes, désignent respectivement, à l'Ecole d'application, l'élève qui vit seul, les deux camarades, parfois les trois, qui partagent la même chambre pendant les deux années d'étude."

The dictionaries seem agreed in their interpretation of this locution. Littré, s. v. *leu*, gives the etymology, "Picard *leu*, loup: locution qui vient de ce que les loups cheminent les uns derrière les autres, *leu* usité seulement dans cette locution." Littré, s. v. *queue*, 23°, cites the only example that seems to have got itself into the standard dictionaries:

"En voyant cette émigration de grandes dames, toutes ces femmes de robe imaginèrent que ce devait être l'usage de la cour, et elles se mirent à défiler à la queue lou-lou révérencieusement et silencieusement devant la présidente Molé, qui ne savait que devenir. (*Souvenirs de la Marquise de Créquy* t. v, ch. 12.)"

The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, s. v. *queue*, calls attention to the "jeu d'enfants, ainsi appelé parce qu'à ce jeu on marche à la suite les uns des autres comme marchent les loups qu'on appelait autrefois *leux*." Darmesteter and Hatzfeld in the *Dictionnaire Général* state that "L'ancien français dit souvent *leu*, forme qui s'est conservée dans à la queue *leu leu* et dans la nomenclature géographique où Saint Leu correspond à Sanctus Lupus."² The same dictionary, s. v. *queue*, marks this locution as "familiar" and "formerly à la queue *le leu*." Furetière, *Dictionnaire Universel*, s. v. *queue*, has this to add:

"Les enfants ont un jeu qu'ils appellent à la queue *leu leu*, quand ils se tiennent l'un l'autre par la robbe en marchant. *Leu* est un vieux mot qui signifioit autrefois *loup* comme s'ils imitoient les loups qui marchent ainsi à la suite l'un derrière l'autre."³

In the face of this dictionary evidence there arises the question: Is it true that wolves do travel "à la suite," "à la file," "les uns derrière les autres"; is this explanation of the dictionaries in accord with the facts of natural history? The present article answers this question in the negative; it attempts to show that the dictionary

² *Leu* in geographical names comes from Lupus, Bishop of Auxerre. G. Paris, *Romania* X (1881), p. 51.

³ In addition to the dictionaries mentioned, I have consulted Bescherelle; Sainte Palaye, *Dictionnaire Historique*; Nisard, *Dictionnaire des Curiosités*; Chéruel, *Dictionnaire des Mœurs et Coutumes*; Billaudeau, *Recueil de Locutions*; *International Encyclopedia*; G. Paris, *Romania* X (1881); L. Sainéan, *Rom. Forsch.*, 23, p. 254; Marcel Schwob, *Etude sur l'Argot Français*; Lévy et Pinet, *L'Argot de l'X*, Paris, 1894; A. Barrère, *Argot and Slang*; L. Sainéan, *L'Argot Ancien*, Paris, 1907; R. de la Grasserie, *Etude Scientifique sur l'Argot*, Paris, 1907.

interpretation is contrary to the facts of natural history, and that the accepted explanation of the locution is therefore false zoologically as it is likewise, grammatically. It further endeavors to provide a new explanation of the locution both adequate and accurate.

As to the question of the habit of wolves, let us get the evidence of the natural historians both of ancient and modern times, also of famous animal hunters both dead and living, and let us consult the fable literature, the bestiaries and animal legends. The natural histories of as ancient a time as Aristotle and Ælian give no data that bear upon the subject in hand.⁴ Buffon⁵ is responsible for the statement that

"the wolf is the enemy of all society; he does not even keep much company with those of his kind. When they are seen in packs together, it is not to be considered as a peaceful society but as a combination for war . . . the instant their military expedition is completed, their society is at an end; they then part and each returns in silence to his solitary retreat."

Abbott, *Cyclopedia of Natural History*, p. 64, says, "whether in the Old World or the New, the habits of this animal (wolf) are the same; . . . they hunt in packs and are extremely fierce and dangerous when pressed by hunger." In the *International Encyclopedia* we read: "In the forests of Russia and Poland wolves appear in formidable packs. . . . Packs of wolves associate for this purpose (hunting)." Champlin's *Young Folks' Cyclopedia* adds the following evidence: "The wolf is very swift and hunts deer

⁴ In addition to the works cited, I have consulted the following books relating to animal lore:—Ælian, *De Animalibus*; Du Cange, *Glossarium*; Kenneth McKenzie, *Italian Bestiaries* in M. L. N., 20 (1905); Grandville, *Scènes de la Vie Privée et Publique des Animaux*, Hetzel, Paris, 1842; Hippeau, *Bestiaire Divin de Guillaume le Clerc*, Caen, 1852; Philippe de Thau, *Bestiaire*; Hetzel's *Bestiary*; Allen's *Bestiary*; Abbott, *Encyclopedia of Natural History*; s. v. *physiologus* in *Grande Encyclopédie* and *Encyc. Britannica*; Champlin, *Young Folks' Encyclopedia*; Cahier et Martin, *Mélanges Archéologiques*, Chap. on *physiologus*; Brunetto Latini, *Livre dou Tresor*, éd. Chabaille; Berger de Xivrey, *Traditions Tératologiques*; de Montaignon, *Les Dictz des Bestes et aussi des Oyseaux* in *Recueil de Poésies Françaises*; Etienne Pasquier, *Les Recherches de la France*, Paris, 1863; de Montaignon, *Recueil des Fables*; Gautier de Metz, *Image du Monde*; Chabaille, *Roman de Renart* et al.

⁵ *Natural History of the globe, etc., from the writings of Buffon, Cuvier and other eminent naturalists*, ed. by John Wright, Boston, 1831, v. I, p. 334.

and other animals in packs. In hard winters packs of hungry wolves come down from the forests of the Alps and other mountains in Europe. . . . Even in France wolves are still plentiful. From 1882 to 1889 more than 6,000 were killed, or above 800 a year." Watson, *Reasoning Power of Animals*, p. 423-4, contributes the statement: "a number of wolves will combine together to encompass a herd of deer on large plains bounded by steep cliffs. While the deer are grazing, the wolves will form a crescent around them and creep stealthily forward, etc." Paul du Chaillu, in *The Land of the Long Night*, New York, 1899, chapters XVI and XVII, tells tales of wolf-hunts in Lapland and stories of the animal's sagacity. "The Lapps among whom I lived were in great fear of wolves, for three packs of them had made their appearance in the forests about 150 miles away. . . . The tracks of three packs had been seen. . . . They attacked the reindeer from various sides, the pack dividing so as to encompass them. Driven off, the Lapps said, 'they will visit us again in small packs, so we must watch constantly.'"

There is no need of multiplying examples. The authorities agree that the wolf lives the solitary life of a recluse in time of peace and that in time of hunt and war he *herds, packs* with his kind. Neither of these conditions conduces to the custom of travelling in procession, Indian file. Everywhere in the wolf literature we read such expressions as "ils vivent par troupes," "leurs troupes affamés," "par bandes considérables," but never and nowhere do we encounter any mention of a custom so characteristic as "in single file," "à la suite, l'un derrière l'autre."

If, then, the natural histories seem aligned in opposition to the theory that wolves travel *à la file*, what of the nimrods? What evidence do the hunters offer, the living and the dead? The books are filled with stories of attacks by wolves, of sleighs pursued by packs of howling wolves, coming forward on all sides, each striving to outdo the other. Wolf-tracks are seen, always a myriad maze of mingled prints. That experienced woodsman, Mr. Stewart Edward White, writing under recent date from Los Angeles, Cal., in reply to a request for information, contributes to this investigation the statement:

"As a usual thing I think wolves are apt to travel in single file through deep snow. So are men and any other persons of any sense at all. Otherwise they travel in a pack just as dogs do everywhere."

Mr. Ernest Thompson Seton, authority on the habits of animals, in response to a request for his experiences on this subject, writes:

"I have seen wolves walk as you say, in single file, but do not consider it characteristic. It was done where there was an obvious pathway, such as a buffalo trail. They straggled along and were not in close array."

Mr. Wm. J. Long, the erudite scholar and naturalist, answering an appeal for a contribution to this subject from his vast fund of knowledge of animals, writes from Stamford, Conn.:

"In the habits of wolves, there is some reason to justify the expression to which you refer. It is not the usual way of wolves to travel nose to tail in single file, but occasionally they do it. A pack never travels that way. At least I have followed many wolf-trails in the snow and saw no evidence of it. When a small band is approaching a danger point, they sometimes swing into file evidently to escape detection. When two or three wolves are stalking game *in the open*, they sneak along one behind the other, to make themselves less conspicuous. I have never known them to do this when hunting domestic animals, or when hunting in the woods. It is only when they are creeping on deer or a flock of wild geese on the open barrens that they make use of this trick. Again in the mating season, a dog wolf will sometimes follow a bitch for miles, nose to tail.⁶ But when there are more than two, the rest keep behind or at one side, and run in a bunch. . . . the expression does not at all go with wolf habits. A big pack never travels this way, in single file, and smaller packs never go this way in play or in roaming the woods or in search of food or in ordinary hunting. In a word it is exceptional. . . . When a student on the other side, I got into the mountains occasionally in my vacations

⁶ Apropos of Mr. Long's letter, cf. Etienne Pasquier, *Les Recherches de la France*, Paris, 1863, p. 708, who finds in this mating season habit of the male wolf to follow the female, nose to tail, the source of the application of this location to the children's game called by the same name. Suffice it to say that this animal habit of the mating season is not confined to wolves, but might have been observed in animals more generally domesticated, and that M. Pasquier's article is otherwise quite as fanciful and unscientific as his interpretations of locutions usually are.

and learned a little of wolves there. But I never knew of their travelling single file nor have I ever read of it. There is a pretty large wolf literature and the beast has figured prominently in folklore and fable. It would seem that, if the habit were common enough to result in a popular expression "*à la queue du loup*," the habit would be mentioned in literature, but it never is mentioned . . . the habit is so unusual that very few observers have ever noticed it. Our own wolf literature, like that of Europe, always emphasizes the fact that wolves travel in an entirely different manner."

And the huntsman chief, the well-informed and ever-ready former President, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, lends the stamp of his authority to this discussion, graciously writing from the White House shortly before the expiration of his term of office:

"I have usually seen wolves in straggling parties, but I have once or twice seen them traveling in single file."

From all this evidence we are justified in concluding that although wolves have been seen to travel in single file, *à la suite*, it was always under the stress of peculiar and especial circumstances, due either to some obvious exigency of the *terrain* or of the season, and that the custom has been rarely observed and is entirely exceptional. Now it is not unfair to demand of a locution that attains popularity and currency that it find its origin in a custom at once generally known, well authenticated and characteristic.⁷

If, then, the explanation of this locution given by the dictionaries is not compatible with the facts of natural history, where are we to seek the correct interpretation? The answer to this question is suggested by M. Gaston Paris in *Romania* X (1881), pp. 50-51, where he says:

"*à la queue leu leu* contient une fois, si je ne me trompe et pas deux la vieille forme *leu* en même temps qu'un reste de l'ancienne syntaxe; c'est proprement *à la queue le leu*, 'à la queue du loup,' et

⁷ It should be mentioned that diligent search of the Bestiaries and of the Fabliaux literature in the hope of finding the source of this locution in some myth or legend was totally without result. The early Bestiaries all seem to follow Philippe de Thaun, giving no mention of the wolf. When he finally does get into literature his identity seems to be much confused, as, for example, in Cahier's *Mélanges Archéologiques*, chapter on *Physiologus*, where the wolf is confounded with the pig.

dans le jeu enfantin auquel elle est empruntée, tous les joueurs à la file forment la queue du meneur qui, il est vrai, n'est pas le loup, mais qui le devient s'il laisse gagner celui qui en remplit le rôle."

Here we are referred to the proper *terrain* for the source of this locution, viz., "le jeu enfantin auquel elle est empruntée." But M. Paris, by his translation of *à la queue leu* as "*à la queue du loup*," shows that he considers *le leu* as a limiting genitive, while on the contrary there is no element in the game nor any syntactical evidence to justify such a conception.

Rabelais,⁸ among the games of physical exercise in *Les Jeux de Gargantua*, lists this game as *à la queue au⁹ loup*. The note of the editors adds:

"Ce jeu est trop connu pour le décrire. Nous nous contentons de faire remarquer qu'on appelait ainsi et qu'on l'appelle encore *à la queue leu-leu*; qu'en Languedoc on dit *à loubet-loubet* (au petit loup), ou *fa à los anquetos* (jouer aux oisons), et qu'on dit encore *Saint Leu* pour *Saint Loup*."

Other editors¹⁰ of Rabelais have exhibited less confusion but as little instruction in the matter of this game, nor do the books on games¹¹ include a description of it in their pages. As a matter of fact the game is so well-known that any French child can recite its rules. The following is the oral description of a Frenchman¹² who has played the game hundreds of times as a boy:

"A crowd of children form in line each holding the skirt of the one ahead of him, thus forming a queue. When the game is pro-

⁸ *Œuvres de Rabelais, Edition Variorum* par Esmangart et Eloi Johanneau, Paris, 1823, Liv. I, c. XXII, p. 430.

⁹ Whether *au* is a misprint for *du*, or a scribal error, or whether *au* was actually in use in the title of the game, it is impossible to say. Suffice it to add that nowhere else has the phrase been seen other than *à la queue du loup*.

¹⁰ M. Paulin Paris, *Manuscrits Français*, I, 1, p. 290 (*Triumphes des Vertus*), discovers the list from which Rabelais took the list of games incorporated in *Gargantua*, but makes no explanation of the game.

¹¹ Cf. *Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v. *jeux*; Becq de Fouquières, *Jeux des Anciens*, Paris, 1869; Bayle-Mouillard, *Manuel Complet des jeux de société*, Paris, 1836; Cotton and Seymour, *Complete Gamester*; Bohn's *Handbook of Games*; de Montaignon, *Comment les Pastoureux et Pastourelles ensemble se jouent en divers jeux*; Philidor, *Académie Universelle des Jeux*, Amsterdam, 1752.

¹² Dr. Albert I. Calais, De Witt Clinton High School, New York City. The correctness of the description here given is further vouched for by Mr. Henri Muller, a Frenchman, Professor at Columbia University.

posed and as the line is forming, all say 'à la queue, à la queue.' Then one of the players, *le loup*, takes his place opposite the leader of the line of players. The latter must keep in line and the leader must face the wolf. Then the line by twining and twisting (somewhat resembling 'Crack the Whip') tries, still keeping the line-formation, to keep out of the wolf's clutches. The players keep up a constant cry '*leu, leu, leu, leu!*' [which, in the narration the speaker unconsciously but very perceptibly pronounced '*le leu! le leu!*'] and when one of the line is caught he becomes *le loup* and the previous wolf takes the place at the end of the line, *à la queue*, all the players moving up."

Here, surely, there is no trace of the single file manner of travel which wolves do not, as a matter of fact, affect, nor of the nose to tail habits of the mating season. *A la queue* indeed means "in single file," but it is a file of sheep, not of wolves; in fact, there is but one wolf, who takes his place *à la queue* when his play is over. *Leu leu*, as M. Paris correctly observes "est proprement *le leu*" and refers to the cry of the children at the approach of the wolf. Where could so natural a corruption as that of *le leu* to *leu leu* take place more readily than in children's games, where rhyming sounds are most sought?¹³ As for the use of *leu* for *loup*, it is the regular Picard form of the word and readily gets itself preserved in this locution because of its rhyme with *queue*.

According to Borel, *Dictionnaire des Termes du vieux français*, s. v. *leu*, in Languedoc the children do not play at all at *à la queue* but at *à loubet-loubet* (which the editors of Rabelais render 'au petit loup,' not as a limiting genitive): This is not at all the game of "tail" but the game of "wolf"; and the manner of playing it ("ils feignent que le loup les vient prendre") bears out the choice of title. In further support of this interpretation comes the description¹⁴ of a Spanish game, *El Lobo y la Pastora*, wherein the children who play the part of sheep (*las ovejas*) stand in single file in one long line, each with his arms about the waist of the one ahead of him. One, who plays the shepherdess (*la pastora*), stands before the others to prevent another player, the wolf (*el lobo*), from catching them. At a given signal the wolf cries: "*Yo soy el lobo, obo, obo, que las (ovejas) comerá,*" to which

¹³ Note that the *Dict. Gén.* marks this locution as "anc. à la queue *le leu*."

¹⁴ *Juegos de Tertulia y de Prendas*, Paris, 1836.

the shepherdess replies, "*Yo soy la pastora, ora, ora, que lo impedirá.*"¹⁵ The wolf, pretending to move against the head of the line, draws the shepherdess toward that side, when he suddenly swoops down upon the foot and seizes the last sheep. That child must pay a forfeit. If the sheep escapes and seeks shelter behind the shepherdess, where the wolf may not touch it, the wolf pays a forfeit, loses his position and takes his place at the foot of the line, the other child becoming the wolf.

If this locution had aught in common with the custom of any animal to travel in single file would it not seem more natural that it should connect itself with an animal whose characteristic habits could be more easily and generally observed than, for obvious reasons, can those of the savage wolf? For example, in Switzerland and in Southern France any day the cows may be seen returning from their highland pastures in single file, nose to tail, if you will; and French does present the locution *à la queue de vache*,¹⁶ which Ste. Palaye explains, "c'est-à-dire l'un derrière l'autre." Here there is an unmistakable descriptive genitive, as in the well-known expression *à la queue de morue*, etc.; but as far as *à la queue leu leu* is concerned, neither the habits of the wolf, nor the method of playing the game of that name, nor the form of the article, justifies the interpretation of a descriptive genitive.

To resume, then, in a word: the dictionary explanation of this locution should be changed, because it is contrary to the facts of natural history and to the syntax. *A la queue leu leu* stands, not for *à la queue du loup*, but for *à la queue, le loup!* and refers, not to any wolflike habit of travelling in single file, but to a children's game¹⁷ in which the players begin by calling *à la queue!* ("form in

¹⁵ Note the repetition of the rhyming sounds, as in *queue leu leu*. Closely related to this is the cry of the Béarnais peasants *gous-gous* (*gous* = chien) used to excite dogs against one another, and the cry of the Poitevin shepherds *goua-goua*, used to incite dogs in pursuit of sheep. (Lazare Sainéan, *Rom. Forsch.*, 23, p. 254.)

¹⁶ Sainte Palaye, *Dictionnaire Historique*, s. v. *queue*, "Messire Jean Chaperon et le dit Seigneur d'Auton meirent cinq cens hommes de guerre en leurs vaisseaux, c'est assavoir quatre cens dedans la nau dudit Chaperon et cent dedans la barque du seigneur d'Auton et se meirent sur mer *à queue de vache*." (Jean d'Auton, p. 112.)

¹⁷ Of course the growth and spread of a game of this sort, and so named, is directly due to the great prevalence of wolves in the Middle Ages and even

line!') and then cry out, *le leu!* (Picard form for *le loup*) in fear of the attacking player-wolf. It is the Picard form of the word that is here preserved, because of its rhyming with the preceding word *queue* and because of the corruption by the peasantry. The article *le* is corrupted to *leu* by alliterative attraction to its neighboring sounds, and because the following word is no longer understood to be a noun.

COLMAN DUDLEY FRANK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

far into Modern times, the great fear they inspired, and the precautions taken by shepherds to protect flocks from wolf depredations. The Pastourelles abound in such references.

GOLONDRINO Y CALANDRIA: AN INEDITED ENTREMÉS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

THE following entremés—till now unpublished—is listed as No. 1127 in Paz y Melia's "Catálogo de Piezas de Teatro Manuscritas" in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, under the title of "*Entremés entre un muchacho llamado Golondrino y dos amigos suyos llamados Garnica y Zaballos, y de Doña Calandria, amiga del Golondrino, y de Vicente, aragonés, rufian, y de Angela, zamorana, amiga del rufian.*" The manuscript is of three leaves quarto. The writing is that of the end of the sixteenth century, presenting certain peculiarities of letter formation common to the much more important "*Entremés de un viejo que es casado con una mujer moza,*" No. 1125, which bears the signatura of Cristóbal Chaves,¹ possibly the author of *La Carcel de Sevilla*, and another commonly given to Cervantes.

As is well known, the great majority of entremeses are in verse, the form and standard being established by the masterful work of Quñones de Benavente, and continued by emulators and imitators such as Navarrete, Suárez de Deza, Cáncer y Velasco and many more, until the days of Ramón de la Cruz in the eighteenth century. Immediately preceding Benavente, however, at the end of the sixteenth century, is a little group of pioneer entremesistas whose best work was done in prose. If none of their productions had come to us, we should still have testimony as to their form in these lines from Augustín de Rojas' *Loa de la Comedia* in the "*Viaje Entendido,*" 1604:²

Y, entre los pasos de veras mezclados otros de risa que porque iban entre medias de la farsa, los llamaron entremeses de comedia y todo aquesto iba en prosa más graciosa que discreta.

Prominent among these are Lope de Rueda, Itorozco, Timoneda, Chaves, Cervantes, and the unknown author of what Cotarelo y Mori regards as the oldest entremés—technically speaking—in the

¹ Foulché-Delbosc is now preparing to publish it in the *Revue Hispanique*.

² Cf. the edition of Bonilla y San Martín, tomo I, p. 143.

language, that "de las esteras."³ It is probably to this period that the *entremés* of Golondrino and his friends belongs.

The future of our little play is bound to be as modest and unheeded as has been its existence of the last 350 years. As it does not pretend to the dignity of drama, it is an impertinence to point out that in structure it quite lacks unity, consisting merely of two unrelated episodes bound but loosely together by the rôle of Golondrino. The second incident seems at first to offer certain suggestions of the Fifth Paso—that of Sigüenza [Iacayo], Sebastiana [mundana] and Estepa [Iacayo]—in the "Registro de Representantes,"⁴ but with the situation slightly modified. There is no clue to the author, however, and conjecture is futile.

He seems, though, to have been no novice in the art of composition. He writes as one with the sense of the proper word at the right place. There is life and strife in his narrative: his dialogue is pithy, spontaneous and sonorous. The connotation is excellent; by their few speeches the several figures take definite shape and character. The "Swallow" in particular, holding the center of the stage with his prose sometimes "*más graciosa que discreta*," leaves a jaunty picture. True, the types and incidents here represented have long since become commonplaces of Spanish picaresque and "entremesic" literature, but we have them here at the beginning of their vogue, at a time when they had not yet been done to death. The *entremés* is never more than a "*rasgo de costumbres*," and our author appreciates the limits of his rôle.

The introductory words give promise of vigorous action.

Gar. So then, Señor Golondrino, there was some lively sword play, eh?

Indeed there was, Sir, and your graces would have been mighty glad to see it.

The preliminary bouts are now disposed of quickly: mere child's play, although, "*entre burlas y veras ubo no se que de chincharras*." There is a certain Falstaffian touch in the Swallow's story

³Cf. *La Revista Española de Lit., His. y Arte*, no. 1, Feb., 1901. Also *Colección de Autos, Farsas, y Coloquios del Siglo XVI*, par Leo Rouanet, tome II, p. 43.

⁴"do van registradas por Joan Timoneda muchos y graciosos Pasos de Lope de Rueda y otros ádiversos autores, etc." Valencia, 1570.

of his prowess with sword and dagger: his "*quiero que sepa que soy onbre donde ubiere onbres*" is almost epic. But now we have the more serious encounter where the author with one well-picked word, "*herrería*," makes us hear the rattle and clanging of the blows. Here the motif suddenly changes, and light is shed on Spanish sixteenth century ethics in the "*sepa Vd. que no hay peor castigo para una muger ques dejalla . . . y el hombre no toma ninguna pesadumbre dándole*." Now the women appear, each in her manner,—*entra el rufián dándole á su amiga de cintarrazos*,—and their rôles are eloquent of the *picaro* spirit of the time. In the midst of great unhappiness, however, the sense of the practical is not lost sight of.

ANGELA. *Mire Señor, que tiene en su poder mias dos camisas y una gorguera; háganle que me las trayga.*

Finally, in Doña Calandria, the supreme touch is added to the picture, that of a fine Latin passion with its logical concomitant, jealousy. The poignant indignation of her outburst, "*Con dama! y quién es la muy puta?*" might well have graced some episode of *Don Quixote*. Surely our unknown sixteenth century extreme-sista might have done much worse and yet leave works good enough to interest students of his country's drama.

G. L. LINCOLN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE PLAY

Entremes entre un muchacho llamado Golondrino y de dos amigos suyos llamados Garnica y Zaballos; y de Doña Calandria, amiga del Golondrino; y de Biçente Aragones, Rufián; y de Angela Çamorana, amiga del Rufián.

(*Entran el Golondrino y Zaballos y Garnica.*)

Garnica. De manera, Señor Golondrino, ¿que ubo tambien juego como eso?

Golondrino. Señor, si; holgaranse vuestras merçedes de abello visto.

Zaballos. Yo fui conbidado para ello, y entre en una casa de juego adonde perdi el dinero que llevaba; y deje de gozar de un rrato tan bueno como ese.

Garnico. ¿Señor, y que jente ubo y quien jugo?

Golondrino. Mucha jente ubo y toda o la mas conoçida, y a fe

toda buena jente hallaronse. Mastre Pedro el çurdo, y Segobia el jereçano, y Diego de la Hoz, el granadino: todos maleteros [sic] de las armas, y Trujillo el diestro, cuyo era el arnes.

Zaballos. Buena jente es toda esa, y quentienden bien el arte militar de las armas.

Garnica. Buena por çierto; ¿y quien jugo con quien?

Golondrino. Dire de los que me acordare, que fueron muchos; para hazer lugar principio al juego el maestro Trujillo, tomo el montante y jugo seis lebadadas estremadas, y luego Mastre Pedro y Diego de la Hoz tomaron espadas solas y, abiendo jugado diestramente anbos, solto Diego de la Hoz y entro Segobia; entre los quales ubo entre burlas y beras no se que chincharrazos.

Garnica. Eso seria de ber.

Golondrino. Si era mas no paso adelante, porque el maestro Trujillo los hizo asentar a anbos y de alli se empezo a alinar el juego; y entre otros muchos que jugaron de los conoçidos fueron Salmeron y Abilse, Zamora y Castillo, el Alferez Cruzado y el sarjento Quintanilla, Perez y Tolomeo, Carrasco y Castaneda, que a fe que todos a una mano jugaron bien.

Zaballos. Yo lo creo, que toda esa es jente diestra.

Garnica. ¿Y que jeneros de armas jugaron?

Golondrino. Espadas, solas espadas y Rodelas, espadas y dagas, espadas y broqueles.

Zaballos. Bueno, por mi bida; y quedaron algunos Reñidos o amotinados, porque de semejantes cosas naçen grandes enemistades; o que fin tubo el juego.

Golondrino. Ese ube de dar yo con pesadumbre.

Garnica. ¿De que manera?

Golondrino. Porque, abiendo sido inoportuno de todos los del juego que jugase, no lo abia querido hazer, por saber quan desgraçiado soy en el juego; pues jugando una vez en Guadalajara saque a uno un ojo; en Valençia mate a otro; y en Zaragoza descalabre al maestro.

Zaballos. Balame Dios, espere a mañana.

Golondrino. ¿Pues de que sespanta?

Zaballos. Pues no quiere vuestra merçed, Señor Golondrino, que mespante de ver tantas desgracias que no aguardaba sino quando abie de decir que abie muerto medio mundo. ¡Jesus, Jesus!

Golondrino. Balame Dios y quespantadizo que es, y que milagrones que haze; pues sepa que lo se hazer con la prieta y mejor con la blanca; y si no fuera tan mi amigo ya le ubiera hecho entender esto con menos palabras.

Garnica. Señor Golondrino, que no lo dixo el Señor Zaballos por tanto.

Golondrino. Señor Garnica, que digalo por lo que quisiere, que quiero que sepa que soy onbre donde ubiere onbres.

Zaballos. Yo lo creo así.

Golondrino. Pues crealo, y si no, busque el tratadillo de mis cosas donde hallara proezas hechas por estas manos que no las hizieron los doze pares de Francia y los greçianos en Greçia.

Zaballos. Todo eso se muy bien, y vuestra merçed me perdone si herre.

Golondrino. Cubrase vuestra merçed, y quiero que sepa que no sufro burlas.

Garnica. Aora, Señor Golondrino, tornando a nuestro juego ¿en que para?

Golondrino. Como digo, Señor, deje la blanca y tome la prieta y una daga que tambien estaba alli; y en el puesto estaba el alfez Escalante; binose para mi de firme a firme; boyme abierto para el, acometeme; a la vista trueco y saco de tajo y quieren decir que le di un cintarazo por la cara de lo que el se pico; suelta la prieta y arremete a la blanca; yo que no fui nada pereçoso en hazer lo mismo, ubo una herreria del diablo; metieronse muchos de por medio y al fin hicieronnos amigos y acabose el juego.

Garnica. Digo que a estado estremado el principio, medio y fin del juego, y que me holgara hallarme alli para en esa ocasion hallarme a su lado de vuestra merçed.

Golondrino. No fue menester, porque no hicieron poco todos en detenerme sin dalle el pago de semejante atrebimiento.

Zaballos. Aora, Señor Golondrino, dejando esto aparte ¿que hace mi Señora Doña Calandria?

Golondrino. Alla vuestra merced al diablo, no me la nonbre por su bida.

Garnica. ¿No, pues por que? ¿que nobedad ay?

Golondrino. Señor, despedila.

Zaballos. ¿Pues por que? ¿que hizo?

Golondrino. Señor, toco en zayna y por esto la eche de mi serviçio.

Garnica. ¿Pues que pudo hazer, que con castigalla de palabras o de obras no fuera bastante sin despedilla?

Golondrino. No Señor, sepa vuestra merçed que al dia de oy no ay peor castigo para una muger ques dejalla y no hazer caso della, porque desta manera ella se queda muriendo y el onbre no toma ninguna pesadunbre dandole.

(*Entra el Rufian, dandole a su amiga de cintarrazos.*)

Rufian. Anda, que te cosere las nalgas a puñaladas.

Angela. Estad quedo, Viçente Aragones, que no se lo que os deçis.

Golondrino. Oygan vuestras merçedes que jente es esta; estemos a la mira.

Rufian. Pues [word illegible] vilo yo y niegaslo.

Angela. ¿Que vistes? dejame, mal onbre.

Rufian. ¿Quien era aquel candilejo con quien estabas garlando?

Angela. Yo librada sea yo de diablo Jesus.

Rufian. ¿Ques de doze reales que tenias oy?

Angela. Yo no tenia doze reales ningunos.

Rufian. No pues [word illegible, as above] darmelos tienes o el alma.

Angela. ¡Ay, ay, que me mata!

Golondrino. Lleguemos, que ya no es de sufrir esto; teneos, onbre onrrado.

Rufian. Mozito, anda con Dios que os daran con algo.

Golondrino. Oygan al borracho con que me a de dar que le desharan la cara.

Rufian. Guarda ladron que te matare.

Garnica. Teneos, hermano, que no conoçeis el onbre con quien reñis.

Golondrino. Guardese vuestra merçed, Señor Garnica.

Zaballos. Señor Golondrino, dejelo estar.

Rufian. Tente, Golondrino, que te llama la muerte.

Golondrino. Calla, fanfarron, que estas hecho un cuero.

Garnica. Aora, Señor Golondrino, sepamos ques esto o por que llora esta muger, y bos reportaos hermano.

Golondrino. ¿Que abeys, hermana? ¿por que os da este hombre?

Angela. No se, Señor, mas de que, por que se le antoja, haze esto.

Zaballos. Señor, esta debe ser amiga deste onbre y sobre el pedille de la quenta; debe de ser esto. ¿Es verdad esto?

Rufian. Si Señor.

Angela. No es, Señor, sino sobre que a muchos dias que digo a ese hombre que se baya con Dios y me deje, y no quiere.

Golondrino. De manera que vos no quereis su amistad y el quiere por fuerza que seays su amiga?

Angela. Si, Señor.

Golondrino. Pues, ¿que dariades vos a quien os sacase de su poder?

Angela. Serville ya toda mi vida.

Zaballos. Yo desde aqui la açoitó; questoy guerpiano.

Golondrino. Pues alto, hermana; desde oy en adelante servireis al Señor Zaballos ques onbre que lo mereze y mirara por vos. ¿Que decis, quereys lo vos?

Angela. Yo si, Señor.

Golondrino. ¿Y vuestra merced, Señor Zaballos, es contento?

Zaballos. De muy buena gana.

Rufian. ¡Oygan, oygan! ¿pues este Señor, que facultad tiene que asi casa y descasa?

Golondrino. No mas que ser mi boluntad y bos ermano y os a servir un amo o aprende un oficio.

Rufian. ¡Oyga, oyga! vuestra merced.

Golondrino. Haga lo que le digo y no mas hablemos que me enojare.

Garnica. ¡Acabe, acabe! haga lo que le dizen y serle a sano.

Rufian. ¿Pues no sabriamos por que me e de yr o quien es su merçe que me lo manda?

Golondrino. ¿Quien quiere que sea? el diablo soy; ¿que ay para ello?

Rufian. No nada, mas de que de mala gana hago lo que los diablos me mandan.

Golondrino. Pues esta bez lo a de hazer.

Rufian. Sea ansi; queda con Dios, Angela.

Angela. Mire, Señor, que tiene en su poder mias dos camisas y una gorguera; haganle que me las trayga.

Rufian. Eso que me place.

Zaballos. Señor, eso no, que se ira y no bolvera.

Golondrino. Pues para eso buen remedio: deje prendas de que volvera.

Rufian. No las tengo.

Golondrino. Pues busquelas.

(Entra la Doña Calandria buscando a Golondrino.)

Dña. Calandria. Toma escarmiento, mugeres, escarmenta en mi las que soys heridas del dios machin. Malaya la muger quen los onbres fia, pues que, a cabo de aver yo serbido a Golondrino seys años y de averme destruydo en quistiones y pendencias, agora me a dado

el pago, que sin abelle hecho nade me a dejado. Boyle a buscar para acabar de desengañarme.

Zaballos. Señor Golondrino, ciertos son los toros; hazerse tienen las amistades.

Golondrino. Dela vuestra merced al diablo.

Garnica. Las de mi Señora Doña Calandria.

D^a. Calandria. ¡O Señor Garnica, yo las de vuestra merced!

Garnica. ¿Que pesadumbre son estas con el Señor Golondrino?

D^a. Calandria. ¡Ay, Señor! no lo se mas de que me tiene golondrinado el corazon.

Garnica. ¡Bueno, bueno, por mi bida! legue vuestra merced que alli esta el Señor Golondrino con una dama, y haganse estas amistades.

D^a. Calandria. Con dama, y quien es la muy puta.

(Arremete con la otra y andan al pelo y todos a tenella.)

Zaballos. ¡Guardese vuestra merced de mi! ¿Que disparate es este? que esta muger es cosa que me toca.

D^a. Calandria. ¡Ansi andaca ladron! que mientras yo bibiere no a de renar otra en tu reno.

Garnica. Hagalo vuestra merced por esta vez.

Golondrino. Hacerlo e por mandarmelo vuestra merced; y vuestra merced, Señor Zaballos, encarguese de esa muger, y cobre esa ropa de ese onbre.

Rufian. Señor Golondrino, pues que sabe que cosa es amor, y que es querer bien, ansi goze vuestra merced desta mi Señora a la qual tome por tercero, que no permita dejarme desconsolado. Yo quiero bien a esta muger con la qual a la vejez me pienso casar con ella; mande que se quede conmigo por esta vez por amor a Dios.

D^a. Calandria. Si por tu bida duelete del pobreto que esta rendido.

Golondrino. A mí, como el Señor Zaballos y ella quieran, sea norabuena.

Zaballos. Yo Señor, como ella quiera de buena gana.

Angela. Pues yo, Señores, como el me trate bien con la esperanza de que e de ser su muger y por no perder diez años de servicio soy contenta.

Garnica. Pues desa manera para mi no son. Cayan norabuena.

Rufian. Anda, cazurrona mia, que a todos bientos te mudas. (BANSE.)

D^a. Calandria. Pues, Señores, bamos todos a mi casa, adonde se hara la razon en regocijo de estas amistades.

Todos. Vamos.

(Entranse los honbres.)

D^a. Calandria. Veyslo quam niño es; el diablo me llebe si no me muero por el y aun a fe que ay mas de ciento en el corral que lo an deseado esta tarde; esto no es verdad: si, pues que hare yo cuytada. Queda con Dios.

FIN.

THE BREVIARY OF SAINT LOUIS (ARSENAL MS. 1186)
AND THE CENTRAL PORTAL OF THE CATHE-
DRAL OF BOURGES

THE central portal of the west façade of the cathedral of Bourges presents two characteristics which so far as I know are unique in the history of French Christian iconography. The tympanum represents the story of the Last Judgment and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and is enclosed by six rows of cherubim, seraphim, angels and prophets in the courses. The lower lintel is devoted to the Resurrection, and as on the portal of Paris, Amiens, Reims, Bordeaux and Poitiers, the moment is that in which the souls, at the sound of the archangel's trumpet, rise from the tombs in which they have been awaiting the last day. The second lintel represents the weighing of souls, the division of the damned from the elect, and the reception into paradise and hell. On the right hand of Saint Michael, standing inscrutable but sympathetic, with strong wings widely outstretched and holding in his right hand the unevenly balanced scales, are ranged the elect in double row, and angels bearing souls to paradise. At the end of this double row, occupying the entire height of the lintel, is a gabled canopy supported on two columns, beneath which Abraham is seated upon a cushioned bench, receiving in his bosom the souls which the angels bear to him. On the other side of Saint Michael are arranged the damned, interspersed with fiends who drive them with forks, to a huge kettle boiling over the flames in the mouth of Leviathan, representing hell.¹ A fiend, on each side, is blowing the fire beneath the pot with a huge bellows.

In the center of the tympanum above, Christ is seated with arms outstretched, between two twisted sculptured columns which support over his head a canopy in the form of a trifolied gable decorated with crockets. Beside him, to right and left, standing with wings outspread, are four angels bearing the instruments of the Passion, while in the far corners of the tympanum, to the right,

¹ Job, XLI.

kneels Mary and to his left Saint John. Above his head two kneeling angels bear the sun and moon.

This beautiful portal presents the most completely developed example of the story of the Last Judgment to be found in monumental art before the beginning of the decadence of Gothic. In the romanesque portals of the twelfth century representing the Christ of the Apocalypse, the Saviour is invariably represented completely clothed, as at Le Mans, Bourges, Chartres, St. Loup de Naud, Angers and St. Ayoul de Provins. In the early Gothic scenes of the Last Judgment he is shown with the right arm and right side exposed, showing the wound in his side, as at Paris, the portal of the south transept of Chartres, at Amiens, Bordeaux, Poitiers, and the north portal of Reims. In this tympanum of Bourges Christ is unclothed to the waist, and the nude torso is modelled with much skill and with evident desire to follow the model exactly. While the attitude of the statue as a whole indicates clearly its descent from the hieratic masterpieces of Chartres and Paris, it is possessed of a spirit of movement, even of unrest, which was entirely foreign to the spirit of the first half of the thirteenth century, and is one of the signs of the extent to which technical perfection was already perverting the appropriate expression of idea. The angels standing on each side of Christ mark another technical advance on the prototypes of Chartres, Paris, Angers and Reims, since on these portals there are but two angels bearing the instruments of the Passion, while here there are four. More than this, these angels, as well as the Virgin and St. John kneeling beyond them, are posed and carved exclusively with thought of their artistic values as objects, and with a skill and fine sense of proportions and of the æsthetic meaning of form which would make us look in vain for a finer result in monumental sculpture. The sun and moon, held by kneeling angels above Christ's head, appear here I believe for the first time.

In the lower lintel the figures of the Resurrection are with one exception nude, and with few exceptions represent beings in the prime of life, according to the doctrine that all men should be equal before God, and at their resurrection should represent their divine master in the perfection of his manhood. But if the "*œuvre*" imposed upon the artist the condition that these statues should be

cut in the nude, the condition fell upon a man whose eye and hand had long before mastered the mysteries of the human form and who possessed the skill to portray them in terms of beauty. They seem to be inspired from the figures at Reims, but they indicate much more intimate and analytic acquaintance with nature.

The upper lintel marks the greatest originality in treatment and in the handling of masses. It is divided into five nearly equal groups, of which that of Saint Michael forms the central part. His wings, which must have been copied from life from those of a large bird, are stretched forth to their full length, and with their tips mark the limit of the central group, including the scales of the angel's right, and to his left a little soul standing by his side and upon whose head his left hand falls protectingly, and then, close behind, a fiend holding a pitchfork, waiting impatiently for his prey. Beyond the groups of the damned and of the elect, at one end Abraham, at the other, Leviathan.

These two subjects present points of great interest, absolutely without precedent or parallel in monumental sculpture, so far as I have been able to ascertain, and of such a nature as to make me curious to know their origin. In all other representations of the Last Judgment in which Leviathan represents the entrance into hell, he is pictured in profile, with jaws widely extended, as at Chartres, Amiens, Poitiers, and also at Paris, though slightly different in treatment. Here at Bourges Leviathan is shown with the top of his head turned squarely to the front, so that both ears and eyes and the nose show in full, with the flaming jaws supporting the boiling kettle above. The two fiends who blow the fire stand one on each side of the head, and that one at the extreme end of the lintel stands with one foot in the jaws of the monster, and the right foot close to its ear. These two demons, the great head between them, one soul standing behind, and the mass of demons and spirits they are casting into the pot above form an artistic group, compact, closely studied and wrought with wonderful freedom and skill. As an artistic element this head of Leviathan is incomparably more decorative, and lends itself to more sculptural treatment than its predecessor in open profile. The modelling of the whole tympanum evinces an artist sufficiently preoccupied with questions of aesthetic effect and decorative significance to have chosen this

attitude of the monster's head for purely artistic reasons. But it was not at the end of the thirteenth century, or even the beginning of the fourteenth, that artists were left to their own discretion in so important a matter, and we must look higher, to the "*Œuvre*," to the direction of the canons, to the inspiration of the bishop, to find a solution of the problem.

Unfortunately there remain no documents which make any mention of such influence, or indeed refer directly or indirectly to the sculptures in question. Until such time therefore as written evidence may be found bearing on the subject of this unique treatment of a common theme, all hope completely to solve the problem must be vain. In the meantime, however, certain historical facts and a circumstance of great interest permit us to form a hypothesis which is both sufficient and plausible.

Manuscript 1186 of the library of the Arsenal, in Paris, is the famous Breviary of Saint Louis, belonging originally to his mother, Blanche de Castille, daughter of Alphonse VIII of Castille and Alienor of England. This breviary contains many miniatures, among which the scene of the last judgment figures several times. In all of these scenes, whether complete or in detail, Leviathan is invariably represented with the head reversed, both eyes looking straight at the spectator, and the nose and both ears shown entire. In fact the pose and treatment are identical with those of the portal of Bourges, and the imitation is carried out with such regard for minute detail that it would seem that a careful study of the manuscript must have been made for the preparation of the cartoons of the tympanum. The ears sculptured on the stone at Bourges are as faithful a copy of those painted in the miniature as it would be possible to make in the different medium and with the different technique of the art. They consist simply of an oval projection, hollowed upon the side toward the front of the face, and correspondingly rounded on that part of the back which stands free from the background of stone. In the miniature as in the sculpture they are attached to the head with a slight turn to the edge toward the jaws. In appearance those of the manuscript and of the sculpture are of the same relative size: in reality, as measured from exact photographs, those of the miniature are one twelfth the total width of the head, while those of the sculpture are one seventh. This

change was rendered necessary by the fact that the detail was meant to be seen from a considerable distance.

Two other points of similarity help to make the hypothesis of imitation almost a certainty. At Bourges, as in the Breviary, the boiling pot is held within the flaming jaws of Leviathan, and into this pot demons are hurling lost souls and crushing them down with sharp forks. Some of these demons are standing within the jaws of the monster. This arrangement is unique, so far as I know, in monumental sculpture anterior to this period. At Paris, where both the pot and the jaws of Leviathan occur, they are placed in the first course, not on the tympanum; and by a genial touch of the artist the jaws are placed above and made to lead down to the pot. This arrangement, however, we may safely attribute to the necessity of containing the group within the narrow limits of the course, and at the same time of filling, in this, a space corresponding in height with the height of the two lintels. At Chartres and at Amiens Leviathan alone is seen, and the verse of Job referring to the boiling pot has been left entirely without illustration. The last point of similarity which seems to show a direct influence of manuscript 1186 of the library of the Arsenal is found at the opposite extremity of the lintel. Here, as I have said, Abraham is seated upon a cushioned bench beneath a canopy supported upon four columns, of which two are seen. He receives *in grembo* the souls that angels are bearing to him from St. Michael. Five little heads of souls are seen looking over the edge of the ample white napkin he holds on outstretched arms to contain them. At Chartres, at Paris, at Amiens the number of these souls is three. There are five in the miniature of the Breviary, and these are held in precisely the same attitude as at Bourges.

I believe I have shown enough similarity between the portraying of the scene of the Last Judgment in the miniatures of the Breviary of Saint Louis and that of the sculptures of the tympanum of Bourges for us to accept as highly probable the theory of direct influence from one to the other. How that influence was brought to bear must remain wholly conjectural, in the absence of documents capable of shedding some light upon the question. In this case, however, as in so many others, facts of history make it possible for us to form a hypothesis. From 1218 to 1232 Simon II de

Sully was archbishop of Bourges. During his administration work was actively progressing upon the cathedral, and he was not the man to be indifferent to the direction work of such importance was taking. To be sure, the façade was still in the far future, but there is no reason for doubting that plans for it had been conceived simultaneously with the foundation of the edifice in 1192; and the archbishop may very well be supposed to have caused the modification of parts to suit his desires, embodying in the whole details which possibly for purely personal reasons he wished to see included in the work. Even these drawings which I am now supposing Simon to have determined upon could not be accepted as being those finally utilized for the execution of the existing sculptures, for these bear every mark of the extreme end of the thirteenth century. However, the details we have credited Simon de Sully with having introduced into the design were evidently, for their artistic value, or through respect for the memory of so powerful a prelate, or both, finally incorporated in the cartoons which served for the execution of the great work.

About the last point in question, as to whether Simon de Sully was familiar with the miniatures of the Breviary, there can of course be no doubt. He was an intimate of Louis VIII and of Blanche de Castille his wife. He was a faithful councillor and trusted ambassador to the court of Honorius III in the delicate questions arising from the projected crusade in Albigeois. He was in Paris for the general assembly convoked there the 26th of January, 1226, to consider problems in connection with the crusade into the South,² and he was one of those to whom Louis, on his dying bed, confided the fortunes and the coronation of his youthful son Louis IX. During the able administration of Blanche this intimacy remained unbroken, and the Breviary of the queen regent, a most remarkable book and probably famous even at that time, must have been many times in the hands of the archbishop of Bourges. Its vivid pictures undoubtedly made a deep impression upon him, and so lasting that when political calls upon him were sufficiently infrequent to permit him to consider the interests and the administration of his primacy, he returned to them

² Chas. Petit-Dutaillis, *Etude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII*, 491, 492; *ibid.*, 506.

with a predilection and authority to which we may be grateful for the presence in the sculptured tympanum of the portal of Bourges of details which render it unique in the history of French art.

If the preceding study presents nothing more certain than a hypothesis, it still shows the way in which I believe the truth is to be found, and possibly some day a fortunate explorer will bring to light a document proving the exactness of my supposition.

FRANCIS DIKE

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A PARALLEL BETWEEN *LE ROMAN DE FLAMENCA*
(vv. 2357-83) AND DANTE'S *PURGATORIO*
(IV, vv. 1-13)

THE following parallel between the opening lines of *Purgatorio* IV and the Provençal narrative poem *Le Roman de Flamenca* is specially interesting, because, according to P. Meyer, "no one in the middle ages has ever spoken of the poem and but one manuscript of it is known."¹ M. Meyer fixes the date of *Flamenca* between 1220 and 1250—early enough for Dante to have known the work, if it had found its way into Italy.

From Dante's own statement we know that he was familiar with the poems of some of the most important and well known Provençal writers, such as Arnaut Daniel, Giraut de Bornel, Aimeric de Belenai, Bertran de Born, Peire d'Alvernhe and others, whose productions were a part of the intellectual heritage of the thirteenth century in Italy.² The fact that Dante in no way makes mention of *Flamenca*, of which the author and original title are uncertain, does not of course exclude the possibility of his having known the poem as a whole or in part.³ But to draw more positive conclusions would be presumptuous.

Flamenca, vv. 2349-83 reads as follows:⁴

Guillems entent al rossinol
E non au ren que l'ostes prega.
Vers es qu'Amors homen encega

¹ *Le Roman de Flamenca*, ed. Paul Meyer, Paris, 1901, p. iv.

² *De Vulg. El.*, I, 9, 10; II, 2, 5, 6, 12, 13; *Inferno*, XXVIII, 118-42; *Convito*, IV, 11, etc. Chaytor, *Troubadours of Dante*, Oxford, 1902; Cian, *I contatti letterari italo-provenzali*, Messina, 1900.

³ Zingarelli, *Dante (Storia letteraria d'Italia)*, Valiardi, Milano, 1901, p. 71: "Nessun indizio abbiamo che Dante conoscesse, oltre liriche, altre opere provenzali come il poema cavalleresco *Jaufre* e la *Flamenca*,... Ma tutta questa letteratura costituiva il patrimonio intellettuale comune in quei tempi, era notissima che non sembri ora, e non ci allontaneremo dal vero dicendo che Dante la possedette in gran parte." Cf. Farinelli, *Dante e la Francia*, Hoepli, 1908, I, p. 40.

⁴ Paul Meyer, *Le Roman de Flamenca*, Paris, 1901, p. 88; Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 24.

- E l'auzir e'l parlar li tol,
 E'l fai tener adonc per fol,
 Cant aver cuia plus de sen.
 Guillems non aus ni ves ni sen
 2350 Ni'ls oils non mou ni ma ni boca;
 Una douzors al cor lo tocha
 Que'l cantz del rossinol l'adus,
 Perqu'estai cecs e sortz e mutz;
 Et aisi'l clau tota l'aurella
 Cil douzors qu'el cor li reveilla,
 Ques outra res no i pot intrar;
 Ans coven que per ioi menar
 Cascus dels sens al cor repaire;
 2360 Car le cors es seners e paire,
 E per so, cant ha mal ni be,
 Cascus dels sens a lui s'en ve
 Per saber tost sa voluntat.
 E quan son lains aiostat,
 Om es defors totz escurzitz,
 Et estai quais esbalauintz.
 E pos mals o bes dins los fai
 Tornar, meravilla non ai
 Si iois d'amors, cant es corals
 2370 E mescladamens bes e mals,
 Los fai tornar ad espero
 A lur senor, si'ls en somon.
 E tut li sen an tal usage
 Que, se l'us formis so message,
 L'autre de re non s'entremeta,
 Mais tota s'ententio meta
 A lui ajudar e a sservir,
 Si que tut aion un consir.
 E per cesta rason s'ave,
 2380 Qui pessa fort, que meinz ne ve,
 Men sen e men parla et au;
 E ia no'l toc hom trop suau;
 Cel colp non sentira negeis;
 Zo ve chascus per si meteis.

In *Purgatorio*, IV, vv. 1-13, we find:

Quando per diletanze ovver per doglie,
 Che alcuna virtù nostra comprenda,

L'anima bene ad essa si raccoglie,
 Par che a nulla potenza più intenda;
 E questo è contro quello error che crede
 Che un'anima sovr'altra in noi s'accenda.
 E però, quando s'ode cosa o vede,
 Che tenga forte a sè l'anima volta,
 Vassene il tempo, e l'uom non se n'avvede;
 Ch'altra potenza è quella che l'ascolta,
 Ed altra quella che ha l'anima intera:
 Questa è quasi legata, e quella è sciolta.
 Di ciò ebb'io esperienza vera.

Comparing the passages line for line, the following parallels appear noteworthy:

Flam., 2360: E per so, cant ha mal ni be;
Purg., 1: Quando per diletanze ovver per doglie.

In the following the resemblance is not quite so literal:

Flam., 2359: Cascus dels sens al cor repaire;
Purg., 3: L'anima bene ad essa si raccoglie.

Flam., 2379-81: E per cesta rason s'ave
 Qui pessa fort que meinz ne ve,
 Men sen e men parla et au.

Purg., 7-9: E però quando s'ode cosa o vede
 Che tenga forte a sè l'anima volta,
 Vassene il tempo, e l'uom non se n'avvede.

Flam., 2357: Ques altra res no i pot in'rar;
Purg., 4: Par che a nulla potenza più intenda.

Flam., 2384: Zo ve chascus per si meteis.
Purg., 13: Di ciò ebb'io esperienza vera.

Dante's familiarity with Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas has, in relation to the above and other passages, been well established.⁵ Dante conceives of the soul as having three faculties, the vegetative, the sensitive and the rational.⁶ These faculties are so arranged that the one is the foundation as it were of the other.⁷

⁵ N. Busetto, *Saggi di varia psicologia dantesca*, *Giorn. dant.*, XIII, p. 113.

⁶ Cf. Albertus Magnus, *Summa Theologia*, Pt. II, Tract. XII, *Quaestio* LXX, 3; in *Opera omnia*, etc. Borgnet, Parisii, 1890-9.

⁷ *Convito*, III, 2.

Dante takes occasion to refute the arguments of the Neoplatonists, who maintain that there are three distinct souls—for, were that true, he would be able to give his attention to various things at the same time, and would not through absent-mindedness have talked so long with Manfred as to let the time slip away without noticing that it was passing.⁸ Dante implies that when, either in the case of sorrow or of joy, or in fact of anything that attracts our attention, one faculty of the soul is entirely engrossed, the whole soul concentrates on that faculty alone, becomes absorbed in it and neglects the other two. Karl Vossler says, commenting on this same passage:⁹ “Die überlegende Vernunft ist im Augenblick des Aufhorchens ganz Ohr geworden.” Natale Busetto writes, citing this passage from the *Purgatorio*:¹⁰ “In quelle non meno rilevanti terzine con cui ha cominciamento il canto IV del *Purgatorio*, seguendo la ben nota dottrina tomistica sull'unità della coscienza, accenna a due potenze sensitive, la vista e l'udito; ond'è che l'Alighieri trovava una correlazione tra lo stimolo esternamente operante, l'organo fisico dell'audizione, lo spirito sensibile, atto a trasmettere l'impressione pel *nervum auditivum* (come lo designa Alberto Magno) e la potenza o facoltà o *virtù* sensibile, ove talora tutta l'anima si raccoglie.” It is not to the whole substance of the soul, but only to the sensitive faculty that Dante here alludes, the sensitive, of which the scholastics distinguish various *potentiae* or *virtutes*. Of these, the senses, according to Dante and Albertus Magnus,¹¹ are passive.

In the *Convito* (II, 14) we have an example of similar abstraction: “Ancora la musica trae a sè gli spiriti umani, che sono quasi principalmente vapori del cuore, sicchè quasi cessano da ogni operazione; sì è l'anima intera quando l'ode, e la virtù di tutti quasi corre allo spirito sensibile che riceve il suono.”¹² Albertus Magnus commenting on Aristotle in *De sensu et sensato*,¹³ says: “Si enim motus est major in una anima, semper minorem depellit,

⁸ Benvenuto da Imola, *Comentum*, III, p. 114. Florentiae, Barbèra, 1887. Vernon, *Readings on the Purgatorio of Dante*, London, 1889, I, p. 76.

⁹ *Die Göttliche Komödie*, Heidelberg, 1907, I, pt. I, p. 180.

¹⁰ *Giorn. dantesco*, XIII, p. 129.

¹¹ *De anima*, Lib., tract. III, 1 (Busetto).

¹² Cf. also *Purg.*, XII, 65-81; *Par.*, XVIII, 22-35.

¹³ III, 3. Cf. *Giorn. dant.*, XIII, 130.

etiam quando sunt motus illi secundum diversas virtutes in anima." In the commentary of Thomas Aquinas on the same book of Aristotle (*Lect. XVII*), we read: "Ea quae jacent sub oculis, homines non sentiunt propter alium *fortiorem motum*, vel *interiorem* sive *rationis*, sicut cum homines aliquando vehementer intendunt ad aliquid; sive *appetitivae virtutis*, sicut cum homines vehementer timent; vel etiam *exteriorem alicuius sensibilis*, sicut cum homines audiunt magnum sonum." As a result of this absorption, we become unconscious of our surroundings, "Vassene il tempo e l'uom non se n'avvede."

In *Flamenca* we find an analogous conception, though clothed in rather fanciful language. There is no division of the soul into faculties, as in Dante, but the author speaks of the senses of sight, hearing, feeling, speech and thinking. The heart is the seat of the senses and lords it over them—the *heart* as contrasted with the *soul* in Dante. Whether in sorrow or in joy, the senses unite and come to the heart to learn its will and command. When one of these senses has a mission to fulfil, the others put all their energies upon that one thought. That is the reason why the more one is engrossed, the less one sees, feels, hears or speaks: there results a total unconsciousness of what is going on:

E ia no'l toc hom trop suau,
Cel colp non sentira negeis;
Zo ve chascus per si meteis.

We have already seen that Dante and the author of *Flamenca* end the respective passages in the same fashion, the one referring to personal experience, the other appealing to that of people in general.

Dante was not the only poet of his time to embody this sense psychology in verse. A few examples from the works of his contemporaries will show clearly that it was a current and customary feature. In a ballad of Guido Cavalcanti,¹⁴ we read:

"Questa pesança ch'è nel cor discesa,
A certi spirite' già consumati,
I quali eran uenuti per difesa
Del cor dolente, che gli auea chiamati."

¹⁴ N. Arnone, *Le rime di G. C.*, Firenze, 1881, ball. VIII.

In a sonnet (*ibid.*, *sonn.* VI) he addresses the *spirit*:

"De, uoi uedete che'l core à ferite
 Di sguardo e di piacer e d'umiltate:
 De, i'ui priegho che uoi 'l consolate,
 Che son dallui le sue uertù partite. . . .
 De, i'ui priego che deggiate dire
 A l'alma trista. . . .

In Brunetto Latini's *Tesoretto*,¹⁵ we find the Aristotelian divisions of the senses.

Chè l'anima 'n potenza
 Si divide e si parte,
 E ovra in plusor parte

 Così 'se tu ci pensi,
 Son fatti i cinque sensi,
 Dè 'quai ti voglio dire;
 Lo vedere, e l'udire,
 E'l toccare, e'l gustare,
 E dipoi l'odorare.
 Questi hanno per ufizio,
 Che lo bene, e lo vizio,
 Li fatti, e le favelle
 Rapportano alle celle
 Chi'i'v'aggio nominate,
 E loco son pensate.

So in the *Tesoro*¹⁶ he refers to the division of the soul into three faculties and discusses the superiority of one sense over the other. In the poem of uncertain authorship, *L'Intelligenza*, we find a similar development:¹⁷

L'audito e'l tatto sono li portinieri;
 E'l senso si può dire la mastra porta,
 E li vari voleri son messagieri,
 Che servon quella nobel donn' accorta.
 La lingua è suo stomento, e giocolieri
 Li spiriti, ove l'anima disporta.

¹⁵ *Il Tesoretto e il Favoleto di Ser Brunetto Latini*, Firenze 1824, Chap. VII, 218-220 and 261-72.

¹⁶ *Collezione di Opere inedite o rare*, V. 50, ch. XIV, 52, IV.

¹⁷ *Ozanam, Documents inédits*, etc., Welter, Leipzig, Paris, 1897, p. 409.

So there was a certain elementary knowledge of Aristotelian psychology diffused generally among the poets of the thirteenth century. Dante and the author of *Flamenca* may have, independently of each other, been drawing from this general fund of information or from some one model. But in citing Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas in connection with this passage of the *Purgatorio*, we should note that it is more close in expression to the *Flamenca* than to any passage written by these men—which would lead us to believe that perhaps the *Flamenca* was known in the Middle Ages more widely than has been supposed.

HELEN J. HARVITT

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE COMEDIA EL SEGUNDO SENECA DE ESPAÑA
OF DR. JUAN PEREZ DE MONTALVÁN

THIS *comedia* consists of two parts, the action of the first extending from 1569-1570, that of the second from 1588-1598. We shall examine each section separately.

PART FIRST

This part covers the period from Don Juan of Austria's departure to wage war against the Moors at Granada, to the marriage of King Philip II with Ana of Austria. Ticknor¹ asserts that Montalván has probably derived the subject matter from Cabrera de Córdoba's *Felipe Segundo, Rey de España, Madrid*, 1619; and Schaeffer² remarks that our author has here reproduced some of the most effective scenes of Enciso's *El Príncipe Don Carlos*. The first of these statements is correct, but exception must be taken to the second, for it is impossible to say whether Enciso's play was written before Montalván's or not. All that is certain is that the earliest edition known of *El Príncipe Don Carlos* bears the date 1634, while *El Segundo Séneca de España* first appeared in our author's *Para Todos*, two years previous. However, since Montalván's genius was distinctly adaptive and that of his contemporary rather original, it seems quite logical that Enciso's drama has the better claim to priority. At all events, the two plays have a number of scenes in common, which is almost conclusive evidence that one has served as a model for the other. Before discussing this relation, however, let us determine Montalván's indebtedness to Cabrera de Córdoba.

A comparison of *El Segundo Séneca de España* with Cabrera's *Felipe Segundo, Rey de España* shows that nine scenes have undoubtedly been suggested by the historian. Indeed in two, some of the verses are all but an exact transcription of Cabrera's text.

¹ *History of Spanish Literature*, Boston, 1866, Vol. II, p. 319, note.

² *Geschichte des Spanischen Nationaldramas*, Leipzig, 1890, Vol. I, p. 442.

These nine scenes, no one of which appears in Enciso's drama, are the following:

1. Act I. Don Juan of Austria is sent to quell the uprising of the Moors in Granada.

Morata.
 el Rei su hermano es la parte
 de quien te puedes quejar;
 el le [*i. e.* à Don Juan] ha podido obligar,
 i èl à Granada le embia.

This corresponds to Cabrera, Bk. IX, chap. 1: "A seis de Abril despachò el Rey a don Juan para su jornada [a Granada]."

2. Act I. King Philip II pardons the son of Octavia, condemned to death for murder.

Octavia.
 . de quinze años matò [mi hijo]
 à un hombre: mas soi su madre,
 i aunque no pruebo el exceso,
 es fuerza que le disculpe,
 i solo à sus años culpe:
 tres pienso que ha estado preso,
 i hoi en revista ha salido
 confirmada la sentencia
 de su muerte i mi paciencia:
 i assi con lagrymas pido,
 señor, à tu Magestad,
 estorves este rigor,
Rei. De parte del muerto han dado
 querella? Hai parte, ò indicio
 de haverla? *Oct.* Señor, de oficio
 la Sala le ha condenado.
Rei. Hizo bien, porque en razon
 del delito no es disculpa
 no haver parte, que la culpa
 le sirve de acusacion,
 mas porque suele la lei
 abrir la puerta al favor,
 i lo fuerte del rigor
 puede moderar à un Rei,

no haviendo parte que importe,
 id!
 i de mi parte decid
 à los Alcaldes de Corte,
 que aunque la Sentencia està
 con su prudencia medida,
 pues que no hai parte que pida,
 templarse en mucho podrà:
 i assi, que el presso le den
 à su madre.

Rei. Levanta,

 pues de algo os ha de servir
 el haverme detenido.

Cabrera, Bk. I, chap. 1, relates a similar incident, in which Philip is yet but Prince and ruling in his father's absence: "Saliendo el Principe de Palacio, le pidio con lagrimas una muger, tenplase la sentencia de muerte, que dio a un hijo suyo la sala del crimen, por aver muerto a otro. Don Filipe sin mudar el cavallo, se informò del Alcalde de Corte que iva en el aconpañamiento, i dixo: La sentencia està bien, i porque no ai parte, i le aproveche averme detenido i rogado, denle luego el preso, i salgan de la Corte."

3. Act I. King Philip interchanges the petitions of Pedro de Haro and Antonio Pimentel for the Bishoprics of Seville and Leon respectively.

Rei.
 leed estas consultas presto.
Santoyo. Obispado de Leon.
Rei. Quien viene en lugar primero?
Sant. Don Antonio Pimentel,
 que es en entrambos derechos
 un Ricardo, i un Felino.
Rei.
 decid, i en lo de Sevilla
 quien viene? *Sant.* Viene F. Pedro
 de Haro, que en la Teologia
 Escolastica es Maestro
 de quantos hoi la professan.

Rei. Pues Santoyo, si el gobierno
ha de venir ajustado
con la profession del dueño,
la consulta viene errada;
mas trocando los sugetos
estará bien; espirad,
i vereis como lo acierto.
Don Antonio Pimentel
es para Sevilla bueno,
pues es tan gran Canonista;
i en essa Ciudad sabemos
que por la gente i los tratos
hai inquietudes i pleitos.
El Religioso es mejor
para Leon, que los Pueblos
de la Montaña i Galicia
mas han menester Maestros
de costumbres que de leyes;
i un Teologo, en efecto,
tiene mas obligacion
al Pulpito que à los textos:
trocadlos por cuenta mia.

This corresponds to Cabrera, Bk. XI, chap. 11: "Conforme a la capacidad de los subditos les daba [el Rey] los Obispados. A los de las Montañas, Asturias, Galicia i Castilla menesterosos de dotrina, Teologos; a los de Estremadura i Andaluzia mas litigiosos, las mas vezes Canonistas i de valor, para conservar la paz de que tanto cuidaba . . ."

4. Act I. The King effaces the word "Don" in the petition of Diego Oviedo y Vargas read to him by Santoyo.

Lee Santoyo. Este dice que Don Diego
de Oviedo y Vargas, que fue
hijo de Alonso de Oviedo,
pide un gobierno que tuvo
su padre en Indias. *Rey.* Ya entiendo,
mas reparad en que el hijo
se llama don. *Sant.* Ya lo veo.

Rei. No el padre. *Sant.* Assi es verdad.

Rei. Pues escribid, que el gobierno

le dñi, con tal condicion,
 que no tenga don, supuesto
 que no le tuvo su padre;
 i es forzoso que por serlo
 fuesse mejor que su hijo.
 Yo mismo borrarle quiero
 de mi mano; dad acá
 la pluma; conozca el necio
 que nadie llegó à su padre.

Our author here draws upon Cabrera, Bk. XII, chap. 3: "En el trapaso de un oficio de uno de Toledo en su hijo borrò [el Rey] el don, i escrivio: No le tenga pues no le tiene su padre."³

5. Act I. The presentation of a petition to the King by the Flemish.

Santoyo. Esta es, señor, de Flandes.

Rei. Què dicen los conjurados?

Sant. Que la paz de estos Estados
 estriva solo en que mandes,
 ò embies una licencia,
 para que sin opression
 de la Santa Inquisicion,
 den libertad de consciencia.
 Sientense de los Placartes,
 i que los Inquisidores
 de sus costumbres i errores
 conozcan en todas partes.
 En fin, piden por merced
 su libertad, con que tiene
 fin la guerra.⁴

Cabrera is again utilized—Bk. VII, chap. 4: "Dieron el memorial los confederados, parientes, aliados, amigos i criados de los

³The inclusion of this scene among those foreign to Enciso's drama may at first sight seem an error, since in *El Príncipe Don Carlos*, Act III, the King likewise causes the erasure of the word "Don" in a document. However, the two scenes are not identical, as in Enciso the document has to do with a sale in "un lugar de behetría"—a matter very different from the transfer of the office to Oviedo y Vargas. Cabrera narrates the two occurrences independently in the book and chapter cited above.

⁴In Enciso, Act I, Montení brings to Philip a letter from Margarita, the King's sister, advising him of the impending rebellion in Flanders.

señores, pidiendo el extinguir la Inquisicion, moderar los Placartes, juntar los Estados generales para alcançar libertad de Religion i mudança de gobierno"

6. Act III. Don Juan of Austria is chosen general of the League against Selim and Mustafa.

Rei.
 Celin, que se juzga azote
 de la Christianidad, procura,
 i con Mustafâ dispone
 atropellarla; Don Juan,
 esta es ocasion conforme
 à vuestro valiente brio:
 i el Papa, que reconoce
 ser vos quien sois, i respeta
 vuestros altos pundonores,
 por General de la Liga,
 que ha de dar espanto al Orbe,
 os propone i os elige.

Cabrera is again followed—Bk. IX, chap. 20: "Fue nonbrado General en mar i tierra don Juan"

7. Act III. The betrothals of Isabel of Austria, Ana of Austria, and Marguerite of France.

Cardenal [al Rey].

. el Consejo
 de Estado os embia à firmar
 del Matrimonio propuesto
 las condiciones.
 (*Dale el papel para que firme*).

Rei. Son estas?

Card. Si señor.

Rei. Passar los quiero.

Lee el Rei. La primera condicion
 es, que como està propuesto,
 Maximiliano Segundo,
 . . . Emperador de Alemania,
 dê al Christianissimo Carlos
 Quarto de Francia, mi deudo,
 à Doña Isabel su hija;

i Francia, como por trueco,
 dè al de Portugal, tambien
 mi sobrino, en casamiento
 à la hermosa Margarita;
 i que luego
 à Don Filipe el Segundo
 entregue [Maximiliano] en dulce Hymeneo
 à su mui querida hija
 Doña Ana de Austria. . . .
 Que traiga, como es estilo
 i costumbre de aquel Reino,
 cien mil escudos de dote,
 ò pagados ò hechos buenos
 en Amberes ò en Medina
 del Campo, i que fuera desto
 trahiga de harras otro tanto:
 i efetuado el concierto,
 tenga obligacion yo, el Rei,
 à consignar por lo menos
 cada un año renta estable
 para el gasto i el aumento
 de casa, i extraordinarios.
 I si acaso por decreto
 soberano me alcanzare
 de dias, i en estos Reinos
 quiere quedarse, la dèn
 de mi patrimonio mesmo
 (fuera de todo su dote,
 Villas, Lugares i Pueblos
 donde quiera residir)
 por cada un año en dinero
 quarenta i seis mil ducados.
 (*Dale el Rei el papel*).

Rei. Añadid que ha de ser esto,
 supuesto que no se case,
 que casandose, no quedo
 en obligacion de nada.

Cardenal. En esta margen lo assiento.

Rei. Que hasta Genova su padre
 la trahiga à su costa, i luego
 desde alli venga à la mia.

This is a close imitation of Cabrera, Bk. VIII, chap. 26, and Bk. IX, chap. 15:

"Pidio [Maximiliano el Enperador] al Rey [Filipe] casase con su sobrina doña Ana, i que doña Isabel se diese a Francia. El Rey acetò, con que el Rey Carlos diese a la Infanta Margarita su hermana al de Portugal, en lugar de la Infanta doña Isabel que para el avia pedido. . . . Mas como daba [el Enperador] a la Infanta doña Ana al Rey Cristianisimo [Filipe], i ya la avia menester [Filipe] para si, por no dexarle [i. e. al Enperador] mal satisfecho por los daños que podria causar a sus Estados i al Enperador, aprobò [Filipe] todos tres casamientos luego, aunque pasaron pocos de los seis meses que pidio para resolverse en ellos" (Bk. VIII, chap. 26). ". . . capitularon el casar su Magestad Catolica [Filipe], con su sobrina la Infanta D. Ana, hija del Enperador, i segun su estilo, con cien mil escudos de oro de dote . . . , pagados en Anbers o Medina del Campo, i su valor se avia de asegurar sobre villas i lugares, i sus rentas i juridiccion; i las arras avian de ser otro tanto. . . . Le consignaria [el Rey] renta estable para el sustento de su casa, I si le sobreviviesse, en cada un año se le avian de dar quarenta mil ducados (no pasando a segundas bodas), demas de su dote i arras i villas donde residiese, no queriendo salir de España, Seria traída con la autoridad i decencia devida a su grandeza hasta Genova a costa de su padre, . . ." (Bk. IX, chap. 15).

8. Act III. The King meets Ana of Austria at Segovia, and arranges for the marriage ceremony.

Rei. Al Arzobispo de Sevilla es esta;
escribiòme que entraba hoi en Segovia,
de Alberto i Vencislao acompañada,
la Infanta; i he venido, como es justo,
à recibirla.
Las bendiciones nupciales
que ordena la Iglesia Santa
me ha de dar el Arzobispo
de Sevilla, que à la Infanta
ha acompañado.

Don Cristóbal. Es mui justo.

Rei. Debo este honor à su Casa,
i al venir tambien, señora,

con vos en esta jornada:
 mas porque accion semejante
 solo toca administrarla,
 como à Parocho, al Obispo,
 (i no puede, si èl no falta,
 dar otro los Sacramentos
 à sus Feligreses), vaya
 à decirle de mi parte
 Don Luis Manrique de Lara,
 que tenga à bien que en su Iglesia
 con su licencia mañana
 el Arzobispo me case.

This follows very closely Cabrera, Bk. IX, chap. 19: "En Santoveña, poco distante de Valladolid, la [*i. e.*, a la Reyna] visitaron sus hermanos Rodulfo i Ernesto, i aconpañada dellos i de los otros dos menores, Alberto i Vincislao, llegó [la Reyna] a Segobia, donde el Rey esperò con su hermana doña Iuana, viuda del Principe de Portugal. . . . Como su Magestad Catolica era tan observante de las ceremonias, juridicion i cosas Eclesiasticas, i sabia toca el administrar los Sacramentos al Paroco, hizo que don Luis Manrique le [*i. e.*, al Obispo de Segobia] dixese, queria [Filipe] le diese las bendiciones nupciales el Arçobispo de Sevilla, que avia traído a la Reyna, i por hallarse en su Obispado se le enbiaba a dezir, para que lo tuviese por bien."

9. Act III. Philip orders the sculptor Pompeyo to finish several bronze statues for the Escorial.

Rei.
 yo tengo acuestas un monte
 en pensar que San Lorenzo
 no està acabado; ya veis
 que las figuras de bronce
 que han de estar sobre la puerta
 ni se hacen, ni se pone
 mano en ellas.

Pompeyo. Es verdad
 que la falta de Escultores
 nos detiene, que yo solo
 hago como solo un hombre.

Rei. Pues escrivid vos à Italia

i à Alemania en mi nombre,
i vereis como nos sobran
artífices que las corten;
que alli todos son Lisipos,
Policletos i Mirones.

An echo of Cabrera, Bk. XI, chap. 17: "Ponpeo Leoni Milanese, i Juan Baptista Monegro Toledano [fueron] estimados porque hazian estatuas que enbiaban al que las miraba muda voz, ciega vista, sangre fria, aquel de bronze, de marmor este."

As already remarked, none of the foregoing scenes is found in Enciso's drama. Let us now consider the scenes which have been suggested by Cabrera and are common—with more or less variation—to both plays, it of course being impossible to determine whether Montalván or Enciso originally derived them from the historian. These scenes are nine in number, as in the first class.

1. Santoyo mistakes the inkstand for the sand-box.

El Segundo Séneca de España, Act I.

Rei. Echad los polvos primero,
para que no la borreis.

(*En lugar de la salvadera toma [Santoyo] el tintero, i vaziale sobre la carta.*)

Santoyo. Valgami Dios, i que yerro!
Por tomar la salvadera, (*aparte*).
tomè el tintero. *Rei.* que es esso?

Sant. Borrar, señor, con los polvos.

Rei. No es sino borrar sin ellos. . . .
Venid, que haveis de esperar
mientras que à escribirla vuelvo,
para cerrarla despues,
si estuviereis despierto.

El Príncipe Don Carlos, Act I.

Rey. Echad polvos a essa carta
y cerralda, que os prometo
que me ha costado trabajo.

(*Don Diego* hecha tinta por polvos en la carta.*)
Que es esso? *D. Diego.* Troquè los frenos,

*Don Diego takes the place of Montalván's Santoyo.

(*Vase al Rey con la carta*).
 y por polvos hechè tinta:
 fuese sin hablarme, creo
 que se ha enojado conmigo:
 su paciencia ygualò al yerro!
 Ya sale con otra carta.
 (*Sale el Rey*).

Rey. Don Diego, este es el tintero.

D. Diego. Huelgome de conocelle.
 para servirle. *Rey.* Haced pliego.

An imitation of Cabrera, Bk. XI, chap. 3: "A las doze de la noche acabò [el Rey] de escribir un pliego, i largo, porque escribia sin margenes, i por echar en el Sebastian de Santoyo su ayuda de Camara polvos, vertiò el tintero: viendole congoxado le dixo, espereis mas, i le copiò."

2. Philip prepares to dispatch the Duke of Alva to Flanders.

El Segundo Séneca, Act I.

Rei. Plugiera
 à Dios que hiciera en España
 menos falta mi persona
 al lustre de su Corona,
 que yo sè que en la campaña
 me viera Flandes armado;
 mas no importa, en mi lugar
 irà el de Alva à castigar
 su ossadia.

El Príncipe, Act III.

Duque de Alva.
 Si me lo manda mi Rey [ir a Flandes],
 no importa?

Evidently suggested by Cabrera, Bk. VII, chap. 13: "El Rey con gran cuidado disponia la jornada del Duque de Alva a la pacificacion de los Países Baxos."

3. The King works far into the night.

El Segundo Séneca, Act I.

Rei. Què hora serà? *Santoyo.* Son las onze.
Rei. Tarde es ya, pero no puedo

dexar de escribir à Roma,
aunque enojemos al sueño.
Esto, Santoyo, es ser Rei.
Leed estas consultas presto.

El Príncipe, Act I.

Don Diego. Señor Mons de Monteni,
el Rey està en su aposento
a solas y retirado,
mas ha de un hora escribiendo.
Montení. El Rey escribe a estas horas?
D. Diego.
Si aora no duerme el Rey,
no es mucho que un escudero
no duerma.

Cabrera writes as follows—Bk. VII, chap. 22: "Recogíase [el Rey] tarde al reposo." And again—Bk. XII, chap. 3: "Fue en el despachar nunca cansado con repartición del tiempo, i aun usurpaba al descanso algunas oras"

4. Prince Carlos attempts to kill the Duke of Alva.

El Segundo Séneca, Act II.

Duque de Alva. Parece, señor, que estais
enojado. *Príncipe.* Què quereis?
Duq. A que la mano me deis
vengo. *Prin.* Pues adonde vais?
Duq. Presumo que à Flandes.
Prin. Bueno.
Duq. Que aunque ya mi edad cansada
havia colgado la espada,
èn efeto soi ageno,
i he de servir i callar.
Prin. I sabeis si yo querrè?
Duq. Sè quien sois, i sè
que os toca à vos amparar
esta jornada. *Prin.* Venis
mui neciamente informado;
ya no estais para soldado,
porque como vos decís,
hacen su oficio los años:

yo tengo quien vaya à Flandes,
que para empresas tan grandes
brios, mas que desengaños,
ha menester la ocasion.

Duq. Desengaños tengo, i brios.

Prin. Mas brios seràn los mios,
porque ha menos que lo son.

Duq. Mas pelea que el azero
el consejo, i el cuidado.

Prin. Pues yo irè para soldado,
i vos para consejero.

Duq. Para todo basto yo,
i assi aquesta gentileza
podrà escusar vuestra Alteza,
puesto que assi lo mandò
vuestro padre, i no serà
razón que le falte en esto.

Prin. Decid que estais indispuerto,
i en la Corte os dexarà.

Duq. Si estoi bueno, es mal consejo,
porque es no tratar verdad.

Prin. Pues què mas eniermedad,
que ser vano sobre viejo?

Duq. Esso de viejo es error
negarlo, pues en la cara
lo digo, si se repara:
à essotro, el Rei mi señor
ha respondido por mi:
pues si por cuerdo me dà
este baston, claro està
que piensa que no es assi.

Prin. No es ser vano estorvar
mi gusto? *Duq.* Es obedecer.

Prin. Pues mirad como ha de ser,
porque os haveis de quedar.

Duq. Acabadlo vos primero
con vuestro padre, i vereis
como os sirvo. *Prin.* Vos quereis
descomponerme?

Duq. No quiero,
sino ampararme de mi.

(Vale à acometer con la daga, i el Duque tiene al Príncipe los brazos).

- Dug.* Està vuestra Alteza en si?
Hai tan fuerte demasia?
Vive Dios. *Prin.* Presto vereis
si competencia me haceis.
- Dug.* Ya es esta baxeza mia.
- Prin.* Dexad los brazos. *Dug.* En ellos
os tuve quando nacisteis,
pero mal pago me disteis.
- Prin.* No me detengais con ellos.
- Dug.* Importaos à vos mi vida,
i quierola defender.

El Príncipe, Act III.

- Prin.* Sentir entre enfados grandes
que queriendo yo yr a Flandes,
Duque, pretendays yr vos.
- Dug.* Sossieguese vuestra Alteza,
que tiene el color robado.
- Prin.* No aueis de yr vos.
- Dug.* Soy mandado.
- Prin.* Que importa? *Dug.* Estraña fiereza.
Si me lo manda mi Rey,
no importa? *Prin.* No importa, no.
- Dug.* Si me lo manda, he de yr yo.
- Prin.* Mi gusto tambien es ley.
Y pues el vuestro se arroja
contra el mio, yo harè assi
que no vays.

(Saca la daga el Príncipe, y al tenelle el Duque el braço, se le cae).

- Dug.* Pobre de mi,
si vuestra Alteza se enoja.
- Prin.* La daga se me ha caydo.
- Dug.* No, deviola de arrojar
vuestra Alteza, por guardar
a quien tan bien le ha servido.
(Alça el Duque la daga y dasela).
Esta es la daga y el pecho
que recibiera la herida,
quando no fuera mi vida
al Rey de tanto provecho.

Cabrera once more—Bk. VII, chap. 13: Mucho disgustò al Principe don Carlos esta eleccion del Duque de Alva, porque se le quitaba con ella totalmente la esperança de ir a los Estados de Flandres con beneplacito de su padre, o sin el. I assi besandole el la mano antes de la partida, le dixo furioso, Que no avia de ir, pues a el tocaba el viage, i no le hiziese; i si contradezia le avia de matar. El Duque le suplicò, mirase por su quietud i vida inportante para la monarquia que le esperaba como a sucesor de su padre en su muerte. . . . El Principe desnudando un puñal le acometiò, diciendo, No aveis de ir a Flandres, o os tengo de matar. El Duque le cogiò anbos braços, i con representacion de gran autoridad le retuvo, i forcejaron en la ofensa i defensa, hasta que el Principe desalentado se desafiò: i bolviò luego con mayor furia contra el Duque para herirle; i el escudandose con valor le retuvo otra vez hasta que entrò un gentilonbre de su camara, i el Principe se apartò.”⁸

5. The Duke of Alva informs the King that Carlos has attacked him.

El Segundo Séneca, Act II.

Rei. A saberlo de vos vengo;
ea, contadmelo todo.

Duq. No ai mas que saber aqui,
si no que el Principe intenta
ir à Flandes con mi afrenta,
i aun sin gusto vuestro.

Rei. Assi:
ya sè que lo deseò.

Duq. Dixome que en todo caso
que en ello no diesse un paso:
repliquè le, porfiò,
dixele que era leal;
mas teneis, dixo, de loco;
no me estima à mi en tan poco,

*Enciso follows Cabrera in causing the dispute to be terminated by the abrupt entrance of a gentleman of the court (in Enciso, Ruy Gómez). Montalván, however, represents the King himself as appearing on the scene, but pretending not to have observed the incident. Carlos then withdraws. It will be remarked that in Cabrera Carlos twice assails the Duke, while in both dramas he attacks him but once.

repliquè casi mortal,
vuestro padre: i en efecto
hizo lo que visteis vos.

El Príncipe, Act III.

Rey. Dezidme agora,
pues sabeys con que cuidado
y amor a Carlos corrijo,
que os passò oy con el? *Dug.* De un hijo
a un padre fuera escusado,
sino me lo preguntara
a quien no puedo mentir:
por Dios que lo he de dezir,
aunque me salga a la cara.
Sobre yr a Flandes, o no,
sacò la daga; yo estuve
muy en mi, el braço le tuve,
quitesela, o se cayò.

In the words of Cabrera, Bk. VII, chap. 13: "El Duque dio cuenta a su padre del suceso, i ambos se lastimaron por el i por otros de la incapacidad de don Carlos"

6. The Prince asks his father to send him to Flanders.

El Segundo Séneca, Act III.

Prin. Pretendo yo,
de mi pundonor llevado,
ofendido del Flamenco,
i en vuestro nombre, gallardo
ver à Flandes, i cortar
de Principes rebelados
las fementidas cabezas.
I vos, à este efecto ingrato,
al Duque de Alva embais,
dando à entender que no valgo
para accion que heroica sea,
cosa que ceda en mi agravio.

El Príncipe, Act I.

Prin. [*al Rey*].
permitaseme que vaya
por Governador a Flandes.

Derived from Cabrera, Bk. VII, chap. 2: "El Enperador solici-
taba la ida del Rey o del Principe don Carlos a los Estados, i el
mismo lo pedia a su padre . . ."

7. Carlos plays *pelota* in order to divert his sufferings from the
ague.

El Segundo Séneca, Act III.

Rei. què hace [Carlos] ahora?

Don Juan. Està jugando
à la pelota.
. . . como sabes, le aprieta
la terciana demasiado.
i
por divertirla, ha baxado
à jugar.

El Príncipe, Act I.

Rey. que haze el Principe? *Ruy Gómez.* Señor,
por divertir la quartana,
à passado la mañana
juzgando en el corredor.
a la pelota.

An echo of Cabrera, Bk. IV, chap. 2, where *pelota* is included
among the sports suitable for Carlos: "Fuese exercitado en çacar,
andar a cavallo, justar, tornear, manejar las armas, jugar a la
pelota."

8. The Prince suffers an attack of the ague.

El Segundo Séneca, Act III.

Prin. [*al Rey*].
Quiero yo poner la vida
al antojo de un balazo,
esera breve de plomo. (*Tiembla.*)
I vos, à este efecto ingrato,
al Duque de 'Alva embiais,
dando à entender que no valgo
(*Tiembla mas.*)
para accion que heroica sea,
cosa que ceda en mi agravio.
O pesia tal con el frio,

à que mal tiempo me ha dado
el accidente! *Rei.* Què es esso?

Prin. No es nada. *Rei.* Notable caso!
La terciana le ha venido.
parece que estais elado,
arrimaos à mi, i sino,
sentaos aqui, sentaos,
tomad los guantes, cubrios.
. Abrigaos bien,
i tined paciencia en tanto
que llamo. Ola, D. Christoval,
Rui Gomez, D. Juan, Soldados!
(*Salen Don Juan i Don Christoval*).

Don Chr. Señor.

Don Juan. Què es esto? *Rei.* Llevad,
haciendo silla los brazos,
à su cama à Carlos, ea.

El Príncipe, Act I.

Prin. mas que es esto?
por mis venas se derrama
un frio, que me ha dexado
tronco inutil, nuda estatua;
tiemblo, y no acierto en mis quejas
a dar forma a mis palabras.
Elaronse las razones:
aprietame la quartana,
estoy—
(*Caesele el sombrero*).

Rey. Alçad el sombrero.

Prin. Por matarme.
(*Al querer sacar la daga, se le cae*).

Rey. Alçad la daga.
(*Caensele los guantes*).
Los guantes se os caen, que es esto?
Tened la capa y la espada.
Jesus que descompostura;
que teneys? colera estraña.
Perdido aveys el color,
. No me habla;
valgame Dios està elado;

llegaos a mi; cosa estraña.

Ola, Ruy Gomez!

(Sale Ruy Gomez).

Ruy. Señor.

Rey. Hazed llevar a la cama
al Principe que està malo. (Vase).

Cabrera is drawn upon again—Bk. VIII, chap. 5: "... enfermò [el Principe] gravemente de tercianas dobles malignas . . ."

9. Carlos is wont to drink very cold water, and stay out late at night.

El Segundo Séneca, Act III.

Rei [à Don Juan].

. . . decidle [al Principe]

que vaya [à Alcalà], con que reforme

el beber con tanta nieve,

i el salir tanto de noche.

El Principe, Act I.

Rey [al Principe].

Days la noche a las ciudades,

Op. cit., Act III.

Lee el Principe. Sale [el Principe] de noche emboçado,
indecente se acompaña
con hombres facinorosos.

This follows Cabrera, Bk. VIII, chap. 5: "Con la indignacion i corage el fogoso Principe abrasado, i del calor del Estio bevia con eceso agua de una gran fuente de nieve . . ."⁷ Also Bk. VII, chap. 22: "Salia el Principe de noche por la Corte con indecencia i facilidad . . ."

There yet remain to be considered those scenes which are common to both plays, but which do not appear to have been suggested by Cabrera. They are three in number.

1. The Prince calls upon his *inamorata*. *El Segundo Séneca*, Act II; *El Principe*, Act I.⁸ In Montalván's piece she is named Leonor; in Enciso's, Violante. The latter is the daughter of the

⁷ It will be noticed that this indiscretion of Carlos is not alluded to by Enciso.

⁸ Both scenes are too long to give here.

Duke of Alva; Leonor, the daughter of one Meneses. In *El Segundo Séneca*, Carlos is refused admission to Leonor's house, and speaks to her from beneath her balcony. Enciso represents him as entering the apartment of Violante and attempting to lock the door behind him.

2. The King, on his birthday, is vexed that Carlos does not come before him.

El Segundo Séneca, Act III.

Rei. I, decid [à Don Juan],
el día que cumplo años
fuera razon que me viesse?

El Príncipe, Act I.

Rey. En el día
que se haze fiesta a mis años
no me assiste?

3. Carlos complains of his father's severity. *El Segundo Séneca*, Act III, *El Príncipe*, Act I.⁹

A comparison of the *dramatis personæ* of the two pieces is interesting. Enciso's production has thirteen named characters, while Montalván's has sixteen. Of the latter, five are found in Enciso. They are: King Philip II, Prince Carlos, the Duke of Alva, Cardinal Espinosa and Don Juan of Austria.¹⁰ The Duke of Alva, however, plays a far less important part in Montalván than in Enciso, appearing once in the former, and eleven times in the latter; while the reverse is true of Don Juan. In Montalván

⁹ Both scenes are too long to transcribe.

¹⁰ Schaeffer (*op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 442) states that the rôle of Don Juan of Austria is a valuable addition of Montalván to the *dramatis personæ* of Enciso's drama. This error is no doubt due to his having inadvertently confused the genuine version of *El Príncipe Don Carlos* with the revision of Cañizares, since in the latter there is no Don Juan. That he was aware of the existence of this second version—although uncertain as to its author—is proved by his words on p. 400 (*ib.*). In the Biblioteca Nacional is an autograph manuscript of Cañizares's revision, which was first published—as far as is known—at Valencia in 1773, in the form of a *suelta*. (See *El Príncipe Don Carlos of Ximénez de Enciso*, by J. P. W. Crawford, in *Modern Language Notes* for December, 1907, pp. 238-241.)

he appears seven times, in Enciso but once.¹¹ Montení is an important personage, peculiar to Enciso; while his Don Diego de Córdoba, another important character, really stands for the Santoyo of Montalván. In like manner, Violante takes the place of the latter's Leonor.¹²

That these several parallelisms are merely accidental is most unlikely, and one cannot but regret that up to the present time no dated autograph manuscript of *El Príncipe Don Carlos* has been discovered to tell us whether or not it was written before Montalván's production.

PART SECOND

Opening with the loss of the Armada, and extending to the death of King Philip II, this part may be regarded as a sequel to the preceding; but it is so inferior that one would wish it had been left unwritten. Apparently, Cabrera has suggested but one scene, that at the opening of Act I, in which the King visits the royal burial vault. The verses are as follows:

(*Tiran una cortina, y descubrense algunos retratos, y en medio un ataúd*).

Rey. Príncipe [Fernando], quitaos la gorra
y hazedlos acatamiento,
como yo. *Prin.* Ya se le hago.

Cardenal. Este, señor, es don Pedro,
primero de aqueste nombre.

Rey. A los pies tiene un letrado.

Car. Dize el cruel.

Rey. Pues barralde
y poned el Justiciero,
que este atributo es indigno
de un Rey Christiano a lo menos.
Fuera de que en los sepulcros,
las letras se permitieron
para escriuir alabanças,
no para dezir defetos;

¹¹ In the love scenes in Enciso his place is taken by Fadrique.

¹² It is only on account of the difference in name, that I have not included Don Diego and Santoyo, Violante and Leonor, among those characters common to both plays.

que no està en uso el hazer
satiras contra los muertos.
Quitalde luego, quitalde.

Don Diego [de Córdoba]. Que valor!

Car. Ya te obedezco.

Este es don Fernando el Quarto.

De don Alonso el Onzeno

es este Sepulcro. *Rey.* Abrilde;

(Abrenle, descubrase un hombre armado, sin espada).

que gallardo!

estando armado, no es yerro

faltarle espada? *Car.* Señor,

un Sacristan deste Templo,

a cuyo cuydado estaua

su limpieza, poco cuerdo,

se la quitò y la perdio.

Rey. Pues ponelde otra al momento,

y buscad de aqui adelante,

para cuidar de su asseo,

un Sacristan sin codicia.

Don Diego. Esta le pondrè. *Rey.* Teneos,

que lo he mirado mejor;

y no parece bien hecho

que tenga un Rey tan ilustre

y tan alentado, azero

que no sea de otro Rey.

La misma que traigo quiero

ponerle.

This follows Cabrera, Bk. IX, chap. 12: "Pasò [el Rey] la Semana Santa en San Geronimo, i la Pascua oyò Misa en la Catedral [de Córdoba]. Mirondo su antigüedad i manera de edificio Arabigo, quiso ver el sepulcro del señor Rey don Alonso que murio en el cerco de Algezira . . . , i el del Rey don Hernando. Tuvo la gorra quitada en tanto que estuvieron las caxas abiertas, no solo con acato, sin con reverencia. Reparò en que don Hernando tenia estoque, i don Alonso no. Preguntando la causa, dixo el Dean, le sacò un sacristan, i le quebrò en una ocasion. Mandò tener mas cuidado, i que se le pusiese su estoque, diziendo, No era razon ponerle al Rey su señor el que no fuera de Rey. . . . En sus Alcaça-

res de Segobia vio que los bultos que ai en la sala . . . tenian sus estoques como en solio, i el Rey don Pedro sobre escrito *El cruel*, la punta en la peña; inscribiole *El justiciero*, i pusole su estoque en alto."

It will be observed that Montalván represents the entire scene as being enacted in the royal tomb, while Cabrera states that the incident concerning the inscription on Peter the Cruel's statue took place in the "Alcazares de Segobia." Again, Cabrera places the occurrence in the year 1570, while Montalván makes it coincident with the disablement of the Armada, or 1588.

GEORGE W. BACON

Wyncote, Penna.

MISCELLANEOUS

ROLAND 2165: *TENDENT DE L'ESPLEITIER*

THE reading of verse 2165 of the Oxford text of the *Chanson de Roland* appears never to have given occasion to the slightest question or discussion; yet I believe that under the *saintenitouche* simplicity of its external aspect there lurks the compelling necessity of an emendation.

MS. Digby 23, fol. 39 verso, ll. 6 and 7 (vv. 2164-65 of the printed text) reads—as the Stengel photographic facsimile clearly shows:

Païen fen fuient curucuf 7 irez.
enverf España ten dēt del espleiter.

My scrutiny was first directed to this passage by what seemed to me the difficulty of the phrase *tendent de l'espleitier*. Gaston Paris, in the vocabulary to his *Extraits*, defines *tendre* (with a reference to this passage) as "s'efforcer"; Gautier, in the vocabulary to his *édition classique*, gives "avoir hâte de"; Clédât, in his edition, suggests, "*tendre de . . . = tendre à, chercher à*"; Bartsch, *Chrestomathie*, defines *tendre* in this passage as "trachten, sich begeben." Professor Stengel, in his *Kritische Ausgabe*, 1901, adopts the reading of all the previous editors. As a matter of fact, the construction *tendre de* appears never to have been used at any period of the French language, the present passage being, so far as I can discover, the only one that even seems to lend color to the idea of such a use. The facsimile shows that, after the letters "ten," a blank space sufficient for the insertion of three or four letters was left by the original scribe of the manuscript (presumably because he could not decipher the remainder of the word or because he found himself dissatisfied with the word he was tracing), and that the letters "dēt" have been introduced by a later hand in the blank space thus provided, but above the line, as if in doubt of the correctness of the insertion.

This being the situation, what light can be thrown on the true

reading of the text? The testimony of Venice-4 and the other manuscripts is here without significance; but, fortunately for the text-critic, Old French literature abounds with examples of a locution which can leave little or no doubt as to the turn of expression actually employed in this verse by the author of the *Roland*. As originally composed, the verse must have read:

Envers Espagne *pensent* de l'espleitier.

Compare the following:

Mès li François *pensent* de l'espleitier,
Outre s'en vont, n'i vellent delaier,
Le chemin *vers* Pavie.

Aymeri de Narbonne, 1976-8.

Dient si home: "Pansez de l'espleitier."
Ibid., 1487.

Pensez, cumpaing, de l'espleiter
E de tost a moi repeirer.
Tristan de Thomas, 2549-50.

Que fais, paiens? panse de l'espleitier.
Prise de Cordres, 226.

Alixandres li prie que pense d'espleitier
Roman d'Alexandre, Bartsch. *Chrest.* 194,12.

Mult pense tost de l'espleitier.
Bartsch and Horning, 96, 9.

Pensez huimes de vostre erre espleitier.
Aubery, Tarbé, p. 100 (cited by Godefroy).

Many more examples are available (and they could be multiplied almost indefinitely) of the locution *penser de l'espleitier*. Naturally, *penser* in this sense is not followed exclusively by *espleitier* (cf. *pense del retorner*, *Raoul de Cambrai*, 2158; *pensez de moi aidier*, *ibid.*, 2596); but the special frequency of *penser de l'espleitier* points decisively to the conclusion that the scribe of Digby 23 copied from a manuscript in which, in line 2165, stood

the word *pensent*, which was either itself partially illegible or had perhaps been legibly miscopied, in the form *tensent* or *tendent*, from a manuscript that was in its turn partially illegible,—either of which forms may be supposed to have given pause even to the ignorance of the much-abused scribe of Digby 23.

It may be of interest to point out that a similar use of *pensar* occurs a number of times in the *Poema del Cid*; cf., e. g., verses 2609, 2644:

Myo Cid y los otros *de cavalgar pennsavan*;

Piennsan se de yr los yfantes de Carrion;

and is to be found also in Old Provençal; cf. Appel, *Chrest.*, 9, 20:

Tantost *pessem del retornar*.

H. A. T.

THE MEANING OF *VITA NUOVA*

IN a brief note under the heading *The Meaning of Vita Nuova* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1909, pp. 227-8), Professor F. J. A. Davidson returns to the subjective methods of the elder Rossetti, which, while of little scientific value, are not without stimulating interest. He suggests that *nova* may mean "strange," "mystic." *Mystic* as a synonym for *strange* is unfortunate: for the critics who adopt the regenerative idea of "new" normally incline to "mystic" as the descriptive adjective for the new life led. The exactest interpreter of this point of view is Giuliani (for whom *vita nova* is *vita d'amore*, purely and simply), just as D. G. Rossetti is the vaguest and most "mystic." It requires some *aplomb* to consider the theory of *youthful* "effectually disposed of" by Witte in 1852, after that idea has been defended at such length by Prudeniziano (1856),² by Cossio (1907),³ and by such a distinguished critic as Casini in repeated editions. Professor Davidson adduces in favor of his suggestion three points: a nine-year-old boy is incapable of spiritual regeneration; "new" does not connote regeneration; then, positively, Dante uses *nuovo* for

¹ Curcio, *Studi sulla V. N.*, Venezia, Olschki, 1892, p. 10.

² *La V. N. di D. A.*, Napoli, Guerrero, 1856, pp. 3-6.

³ *Sulla V. N. di D.*, Firenze, Olschki, 1907, pp. 18-9.

"mystic." But the *Vita nova* is not the work of a nine-year-old boy. *New* is an indeterminate word, and may take on any connotation whatsoever. The philological argument has two defects: it is needless, in that "strange" is a very frequent old Italian meaning for *nuovo*, but not more frequent than the ordinary sense; Professor Davidson's citations prove at best not more than this. Then this argument may be used, as actually was done by Prudenziario and others, to prove the other points of view. It establishes merely a possibility, which can derive support only from evidence of an exegetical nature. Here the obstacles seem insuperable. We should also expect this idea to have occurred to some early commentator, familiar currently with this alleged sense of *nuovo*. To go here into the question whether the title is Latin or Italian is scarcely worth while; it may be either.

Karl Federn in his translation of the *Vita Nuova* hints vaguely at the meaning suggested:⁴ to Dante, Beatrice was "ein liebliches wunder, ein *novum*, ein *neun*." Here too we have associated *novum* with *novem*, a query which Professor Davidson also proposes. The debate might include as well *Paradiso* II, v. 8;⁵ and Ovid, *Metam.*, 14, 58:

Obscurum verborum ambage novorum
Ter novies carmen magico demurmurat ore.

Whether the two words were actually associated in Dante's mind we of course can never know, unless direct testimony be discovered. I may recall that Dr. Levi Leonard Conant⁶ insists that this association is universal: "Between the Latin words *novus*, 'new' and *novem*, 'nine,' there exists a resemblance so close that it may well be more than accidental. Nine is then the *new* number, that is the first number on a *new* count of which eight must originally have been the base. Pursuing this thought by investigation into different languages the same resemblance is found there." If the association has occurred to Mr. Conant and Professor Davidson, why not to Dante? Everything is grist that comes to the imagi-

⁴ *Das Neue Leben des D. A.*, Halle, Hendel, p. 26.

⁵ Poletto, *Dizionario Dantesco*, 1886, vol. III, pp. 366-7.

⁶ *The number concept, its origin and development*, MacMillan, 1898. See *Athenaeum*, 1898, Part II, p. 326.

native mill: the elder Rossetti insisted that in the Ghibelline *gergo* "il ghibellinismo fu detto *vita* ed il guelfismo *morte*; perciò Dante chiamò la *V. N.* il nuovo corso di sua vita politica, e nascimento l'istante in cui v' entrò!"⁷ We need not mention that grotesque interpretation of M. Clecner (Sinowitz) for whom Beatrice is an allegory of the Talmud and the *Vita Nova* a source book of cabalistic symbolism.⁸

A. A. LIVINGSTON

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE SUFFIXES -ASTER, -IGNUS, ETC., IN NOUNS OF RELATIONSHIP

IN an article on the *Interchange of suffixes -aster, -ignus and -icus* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1909, 241-3), Mr. S. G. Patterson sustains that, in words of step-relationship, in addition to the endings -aster and -ignus (of Lat. *privignus*¹), the termination -icus (of Lat. *vitricus*) survives, not only in Sard. *bidrigu*, etc. and Rum. *vitrigu*, etc., but also in O. Fr. *serorge*, etc. (Godefroy) and in Neapol. *matreye* and *patreye*.

After considering the diffusion of -aster and -ignus, the author summarizes: "Enough examples have been given to show the constant interchange of -ignus and -aster in these words of quasi-kinship . . . in several dialects the same stem is found compounded indifferently with either suffix (cf. Venet.)." He doubtless means rather alternation than interchange; for no real interchange is demonstrated: the diffusion of Ven. *pareastro* is not precisely the same as that of *paregno*; Boerio limits the first to Chioggia.² We need similar light on the Raetian *madrastra*, -igna. We should have documentary proof of Meyer Lübke's citation of "*patrigno*, *matrigna* refaits à l'époque romaine déjà sur *privignus*." That we have here a case of irradiation (in Bréal's diction) is doubtful, in that the suffix -ineus of *sanguineus*, *consanguineus*, *stamineus*,

⁷ Cf. Prudeniziano, *op. cit.* p. 33, after Rossetti's *Commento*, vol. II, p. 355.

⁸ Michael Sinowitz, *Schlüssel zu D. A.'s Werke: Das Neue Leben*, Zürich, Clecner, 1905.

¹ Cf. Festus, *De Significatione Verborum*, s. v.

² *Diz. del dialetto veneziano*, Venezia, 1856, s. v. *pareastro*.

has had, especially in words of color, much the same history as *-aster*: *giallastro*, *sanguigno*.³ Nor can we, as regards general method, treat these suffixes as specifically connoting relationship, apart from their broader use with other words as pejoratives or descriptives, like Eng. *-ish*: *marâtre* now actually means "mother." Further the Italian preference for *-igno* forms remains unexplained: it is due to the difficult combination of *-tr- -tr-* in *matrastra*, etc., which the Portuguese, Catalan and other languages have obviated by simple dissimilation, *-dr- -t-*, *-d- -tr-*. It is interesting that some regions have not felt difficulty in this succession of sounds. Only brief reference is made to questions of semantics; but the statement that *-aster* is applied to *frater* for both genders is misleading; *fratellastra* means not "half-sister" but "half-brother's wife." It is not to be confused with the double use of *serorge*. It is the pejorative connotation of *-âtre* that has led to its practical displacement by forms with *beau-* and *belle-*. *Beau* was used to a considerable extent in medieval titles of address: *beaus amis*, etc. M. Thomas has noted⁴ that this mannerism has survived only for the more distant relationships. *Belle soeur*, more courteous and formal than *ma soeur*, was too stately for the home circle, but quite appropriate to kinship by marriage. For the forms cited by the author, we may add that *sorellastra* is quite literary; besides *matrigno* and *patrigno* we have forms with *d*.

Diez' assumption of *sororius* > *serourge* has in its favor the fact that *sororius*, as Mr. Patterson has noted, is an early Latin word. The development *-rj-* > *ge* is indeed exceptional in the Ile de France, but certainly not in the eastern dialects. Groeber has already designated *serorge* a *lehnwort*.⁵ Middle Latin *sororius* may represent a true Vulgar Latin semantic change and be of a nature quite different from that of *serorgius*, which Mr. Patterson correctly interprets. There is no difficulty with the thought transference, which is exactly parallel to that of *fratellastra*, etc., sister like, brother-like; the doubling of gender is paralleled in *figli* "son

³ Cf. Pianigiani, *Dis. etimologico della lingua ital.*, Roma, Albrighi-Segati, 1907, s. v. *matrigna*; and Cohn, *Suffixverwandlung*, Halle, 1891, p. 168; and cf. Morandi's *Grammatica*, p. 344.

⁴ *Dict. Gén.*, s. v. *beau-frère*.

⁵ *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie*, V, 473.

and daughter." Its vitality was assisted by the avoidance of pejorative *-aster*. The evidence for the survival of *-icus* is of no value: Sardinian and Rumanian represent archaic forms of Latin; they cannot serve as proof of the condition of continental Vulgar Latin posterior to the third century.⁶ Surely the Slavic and Celtic parallels are totally irrelevant unless supported by some evidence that these appearances are directly due to Latin influence.⁷ The forms cited for Huy and Liège by Godefroy may all be explained by *sororius*. We need to know more of the environment and history of *serouque* before we draw any general conclusions from it. This applies as well to the Neapolitan *matreye* and *patreye*. The theory of Greek influence has great probability from the fact that Greek was spoken in the Napoletano till the latest period of the Empire.⁸ Far from being incredible that *-icus* should have disappeared from words of this class, its ready failure may be explained, first because it is unaccented, and then by its frequency in other words of different meaning.

In spite, therefore, of the acute reasoning by which this interesting suggestion is supported, we are inclined to the traditional view of *serourge* < *sororius*. We may add that the orthographic scheme adopted by the author for dialect forms is open to some criticism: his rendering of Ven. *-gn-* is unnecessary and that of the Neapolitan and Albanian off-glide, unclear. Important dialect forms should be cited from documents, and need careful definition as to time and place.

A. A. LIVINGSTON

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

⁶ Pušcariu, *Tj, Cj, im Rumänischen, Ital. und Sard.*, Halle, 1904, pp. 5-18. Reservation must here be made for Christian missionaries, who, however, introduced only words of ecclesiastical nature.

⁷ I am told that Slavic *-ka* is usually diminutive; that it appears in relatively few words of step-kinship, which are frequently rendered by circumlocutions. Slavic *polnica* sometimes means 'step-mother'; some of the examples cited have *-ca* but with the sound *tca*.

⁸ Budinsky, *Die Ausbreitung der latein. Sprache*, Berlin, 1881, p. 44.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Los Amantes, tragedia original de Andrés Rey de Artieda, precedida de una noticia biográfica y bibliográfica del autor por Francisco Martí Grajales. Publicala nuevamente Francisco Carreres y Vallo. Valencia, M. Pau, 1908. 4to, xxxiv + 80 + 5 pp.

Our gratitude towards Sr. Carreres for reprinting the unique copy of the first dramatic version (1581) of *los Amantes de Ternel*, is tempered by regret that he should have seen fit to limit his edition to fifty-one copies. The interest of Artieda's tragedy is, to be sure, largely historical: it is the only play by the author still extant; it treats a popular, national, and almost contemporaneous subject (ca. 1535), in accordance with pseudo-classic principles, discarding, however, royal personages; it is probably the oldest extant Valencian play of the school which immediately followed Timoneda's; it served as a model for the mediocre version of a great dramatist, Tirso de Molina; and, finally, every play of the last decade of the sixteenth century, when the New Comedy was being evolved, is of interest, at least to the student, and deserves to be made accessible.

Sr. Carreres' edition contains a long biographical and bibliographical study by the Valencian scholar, Martí Grajales. It adds nothing of importance, however, to what was already known of Artieda and his works. The remarks on the play itself are unfortunately limited to bibliographical details. It might have been better, although doubtless infinitely more difficult, to indicate the place of *Los Amantes* in Valencian dramatic literature, and to estimate its value as a tragedy.¹ To assign the play peremptorily to the Cueva school, as Schack has done, is to impute servility on the part of Artieda which is probably unjustifiable. In the matter of strophic structure, a significant criterion, his play is quite different from Cueva's dramas. The backbone of Artieda's play is the *quintilla*, a strophe that Cueva never used—Tárrega and Aguilar, Valencians like Artieda, did. On the other hand, tercets, of which the Sevillian was very fond, are wholly lacking in *Los Amantes*. The exact date of composition of Artieda's tragedy cannot be determined. It was printed in 1581, and licensed in February of the same year. In the dedicatory epistle, which constitutes a confession of the author's dramatic faith, reference is made to Bermúdez's *Nise* plays (1577), "*impresos los ví, no ha muchos meses.*" None of Cueva's plays are earlier than 1579, and although it would be rash to conclude from Artieda's words that his drama was written shortly after 1577 and before 1579, it is equally rash to take it for granted that he imitated Cueva. The following lines from his epistle, an *ars dramatica* which preceded the Sevillian's *Exemplar poética*

¹ After the exhaustive studies by Cotarelo, Menéndez y Pelayo, and Gascón, no account of the legend was to be expected in this introduction. Hispanists may be reminded here of Mr. Hamelius' article in the *Modern Language Review* (IV, 352), where it is shown that Southerne's "Fatal Marriage" is based on a Spanish version of the legend.

by twenty-six years, show that Artieda could think for himself in the matter of dramatic art:

Digo que España está en su edad robusta,
y como en lengua, y armas valga, y pueda,
me parece gustar de lo que gusta . . .

Por ello, y porque mil exemplos tuue,
siguiendo el uso y plática Española,
de mi Tragedia hazer dos partes huue.

Pero porque cualquiera de ellos sola,
cansar pudiera, la razón y el vso
(digo Español) en otras dos partióla.

Si la materia dizen que no es alta,
pues para hablar de Príncipes, y Reyes,
el hombre, y reyno á los Amantes falta,

Miren los que ordenaron essas leyes,
que sacar al Theatro vn Minotauro,
fué mandarnos tratar con semibueyes.

Aquí no hay hydra, furia, ni Centauro,
solo hay vn cauallero, y vna dama,
que pretenden ganar á Laura el lauro.

As the play is still almost as inaccessible as ever, and will remain so until copies fall into the hands of second-hand booksellers, it may not be amiss to quote here a typical scene.² The drama contains some strong scenes, but the work as a whole is rather amateurish. The most poetical passages are the *relaciones*, which are not however dramatic. Some scenes, as, for example, where Marcilla first meets Sigura on his return, and chides her for not waiting a little longer than the prescribed seven years and an hour, are cold and disappointing. The matronlike attitude of Sigura is dignified and proper, but unconvincing. A representative short scene is the following,—Marcilla's body has just been found beside Sigura's bed, and the husband and wife take counsel to remove it:

Marido. A no pretender, que eres
tan diferente en obras, y costumbre,
de las otras mugeres,
diérame este negocio pesadumbre.

Pero quien de ver hecha
tu vida, que jamas desmintió en cosa,
qualquier sombra, o sospecha,
que tenga escandalosa,
despide, y despidiéndola, reposa?

Aunque quiero con todo,
ya que la muerte se diulgue, y sepa,
que no se entienda el modo;
pues corta el vulgo, y trepa,
y haze que donde no hay malicia quepa.

² The play is analyzed in Cotarelo's study, p. 33.

- No dirá lo que passa,
quien viese que Marcilla te ha querido,
y que muere en mi casa?
por esso abre el oydo,
y no mueuas, sacándole, ruydo.
- Sigura.* Señor, como lo mandes,
mira bien que la noche es breue, y corta,
y en estos casos grandes,
la diligencia importa.
- Marido.* Verdad es, mas sossiégate, y reporta.
- Sigura.* Todo está libre, y quedo.
- Marido.* Ea! saquémosle. Pero yo solo,
como lo ves, no puedo:
sostén, mientras le arboló:
pero que tu le tengas mereciólo?
- Sigura.* No apuntes, señor, esso;
basta que porque á ti y á mí nos quadre
nos: partamos el peso.
- Marido.* Aquí duerme su padre.
- Sigura.* Pues, sus! recógale su antigua madre.
- Marido.* Ya que se queda agora
do entenderán en darle sepultura,
boluámosnos, señora,
que amanece; y procura
cubrir lo que la noche encubre oscura.
- Sigura.* Passo, no hables palabra,
que las ventanas de su padre siento.
- Marido.* Pues antes que las abra
vámonos. Prisa y tiento;
recoge de vna vez huelgo y aliento.*

MILTON A. BUCHANAN

University of Toronto

La Chevalerie Vivien, Chanson de Geste. By A. L. TERRACHER. Vol. I, Textes.
Paris, H. Champion, 1909.

The *Chevalerie Vivien* has waited many years for an adequate edition. Jonckbloet published the poem in his, at the time, valuable work: *Guillaume d'Orange*, La Haye, 1854, and included a relation of its events in his *Guillaume d'Orange, Chanson de Geste du XII^e Siècle*, Amsterdam, 1867. His edition was unfortunate in being a composite based on two manuscripts not of the best. One result of the Jonckbloet edition was that the poem was not esteemed at its true value. This condition of affairs will be remedied by the excellent edition of Mr. Terracher.

The editor selected as the basis for his text MS. 1448 of the Bibliothèque

* Some misprints occur: p. xxii, read *El principe vicioso*, not *constante*. Are such forms as *su* (for *se*), *quanti* (*quanto*), *pussible* (*possible*), *siquiera* (*siquiera*), *muche* (*mucho*), etc., misprints of the original edition?

Nationale, in accordance with the opinion of Nordfelt: *vide* Wahlund and Feilitzen, *Enfances Vivien*, Paris and Upsala, 1895, p. xvi; *cf.* Willy Schultz, *Das Handschriftenverhältnis des Covenant Vivian*, Halle, 1908, p. 67. Few alterations are made in the text of this MS., for which moderation thanks are due the editor, who has not yielded to the allurements of subjective scholarship. The text of MS. 1448 is printed on the left-hand pages, while that of the MS. of Boulogne appears on the right-hand pages, this latter MS. differing so widely from the other that it would have been difficult and cumbersome to give its variants. For the other MSS., their variants are given at the bottom of the pages. The arrangement is unusually clear, and is carried out with accuracy. At the close of the texts in verse, the editor has printed the prose version, which exists in two MSS. The first volume of Mr. Terracher's work is thus given up to the texts themselves. The second volume will include a discussion of the classification of the MSS., their age, dialect and other points of critical interest.

A careful examination of the texts as given in the present volume shows that we have here one of the most accurately prepared works that have appeared in Old French. The editor has evidently applied himself with the utmost fidelity to his task, and has understood that the cardinal duty of an editor of such texts is to render, with the highest degree of accuracy, just what the originals offer. His work accordingly provides a sure foundation for a critical study of the *Chevalerie*.

A few minor paleographical points may be mentioned. In MS. C, lines 397, 638, 681, 772, 1497, the reading appears to be *Blavies*. Line 955, read: *entrer*; lines 1063, 1064: *commanch*, *manch*; 1218: *esraument*. In line 1436, the MS. has *Autor*, which is of course to be interpreted: *Au tor*; in line 1768, *di*. The reading of the MS. in line 1765: *a poi ne*, is defensible.

RAYMOND WEEKS

Columbia University

Lecciones de Literatura Española por Jaime Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Catedrático de Lengua y Literatura Españolas en la Universidad de Liverpool. Traducción directa del Inglés por Diego Mendoza, con un prólogo de Rufino José Cuervo. Madrid, Victoriano Suarez. 1910. 8vo, pp. 326.

There can be no better evidence of the high esteem in which Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's work, *Chapters on Spanish Literature* (London, Archibald Constable and Company, 1908), is held by scholars in Spain than the fact that within so short a time of its publication a Spanish translation should be demanded. In his introduction, the distinguished philologist, D. Rufino José Cuervo, alluding to the well-known competency of Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly in all matters relating to the literature of Spain, remarks that the opinions of a foreigner are always of particular interest inasmuch as the difference of atmosphere and of studies produces a different point of view, from which peculiarities are often observed which remain hidden from the native. Sr. Cuervo calls attention to what is certainly one of the chiefest charms of Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's work: "la soberana claridad y elegancia de las *Lecciones*, formando cada cual de ellas un cuadro de acabada perfección." Indeed, we can do no better than to continue in Sr. Cuervo's words, which show how the *Lecciones* are regarded by so eminent an authority:

No menor encomio se debe á la manera y al estilo del autor. Ni sus vastos conocimientos le engrien, ni su calidad de extranjero se deja percibir por especie alguna de dureza ó desdén. Profesando el principio de que "el alma de la crítica consiste en la estimación justa de los valores relativos, sin dejarse arrastrar á la idolatría y ni siquiera á la lisonja," no se aparta una línea de él, armado como está para ello con la preparación más necesaria, qual es la versación en la literatura clásica y en las principales modernas. Con esto, al juzgar nuestras obras, alcanza su criterio una amplitud, serenidad y mesura que dan á sus opiniones fuerza convincente; y el amor que tiene probado á las letras españolas, va acompañado, como el que es verdadero en la vida social, con una delicadeza tal, que, cuando descubre ó refuta un error, no formula sentencia áspera ó infamante, sino que, á lo más, se vale de una amable ironía que pone de su parte al lector, provocandole alguna sonrisa de aquiescencia.

This admirable quality in our author—his urbanity "when he discovers or refutes an error"—has doubtless particularly impressed Sr. Cuervo because it is so conspicuously absent in many critics of Spanish literature. Sr. Cuervo concludes as follows: "In a word, no work seems more adequate than the present to inculcate a love of sane and solid erudition, which is here combined with amenity of presentation and a judicious and impartial criticism, in a style that is sober, distinguished and captivating." The justice of this judgment no one will deny, for in the present work, as in all of Prof. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's writings upon Spanish literature, are united the soundest scholarship with a clearness and elegance of style most rare in works of erudition.

Sr. Mendoza's part of the book is excellently well done. It is an adequate translation of a work that is in every way admirable.

HUGO A. RENNERT

University of Pennsylvania.

Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature française moderne (1500-1900). I. Seizième Siècle. Par GUSTAVE LANSON. Paris, Hachette et Cie, 1909. xv + 247 pp.

The present work, which was composed by M. Lanson with the assistance of a number of his pupils, is merely intended to serve as a guide for students who desire to gain a more thorough knowledge of French literature. Hence, certain chapters (such as the chapter on translations), on which histories of literature give little or no information, have been enlarged; whereas others (cf. the chapter on Ronsard) are intentionally incomplete, inasmuch as abundant information on these subjects can be found without difficulty. Likewise, the chapters on memoirs, letters, administrative and political literature, usually neglected in literary histories, are developed more at length in this manual. Finally, the author has attempted to enlarge the list of reviews and bulletins of learned societies, for much of the useful work on this period is to be found scattered through their pages.

It is needless to say that the work of M. Lanson is well done: his *Manuel* should prove indispensable to the neophyte. An alphabetical index, however, of the authors mentioned would greatly facilitate the use of this excellent little work. It is quite difficult at times for one not thoroughly acquainted with M. Lanson's method to discover under what heading a work may be given. Every one has realized that the one great defect of Baudrier's masterly *Bibliographie lyonnaise* is the want of such an index, which causes an unnecessary loss of time and patience. That an alphabetical index would not unduly enlarge the

Manuel is obvious from the fact that Charléty's well-known *Bibliographie critique de l'Histoire de Lyon* has only nine pages of index, though it contains some 340 pages of titles. Furthermore, it might be maintained that M. Lanson's method of classification would have been more satisfactory and comprehensible had it followed more closely the more careful and minute methods of Picot and Charléty.

It is to be regretted also that the author was unable to insert a page or two on the jurisconsults of the sixteenth century. While not immediately related to French literature, nevertheless a knowledge of their works, though they are written in Latin, is often necessary; for many of the most important scholars and literary personages of this period touched frequently upon legal subjects. And speaking of Latin, we are forced to regret the almost entire omission of the important Latinists of the sixteenth century. It might of course be objected that as this is a bibliography of French literature, Latin authors should be neglected. This is without doubt true when treating the latter part of the sixteenth century; but it is altogether different with regard to the Renaissance. Not a step in literary research in that period can be made without consulting the works of the Latinists, for their relations with the French authors were of the most intimate kind. The few indications given on p. 175 (2055-2061) are insufficient. The works of Macrin, Voulte, Ducher, Bourbon, and a host of others are strewn with references to their contemporaries, while the correspondence of Sadolet, Bunel, Boyssonné, etc., contain a fund of information not to be found elsewhere.

M. Lanson states (p. vii) that this is a *bibliographie choisie, donc incomplète*. Herein the reviewer wishes to call attention to a few things which have been inadvertently overlooked. First, on p. 5 we would expect to find Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis*, 1545, which completes in many respects La Croix du Maine, Du Verdier and others. Next, in the long and excellent list of histories of colleges, etc. (pp. 20 *et seq.*), no mention is made of the *Collège de la Trinité* of Lyons, which was certainly equal in importance to the majority of those given by M. Lanson. While the brief study of Demogéot (*Collège de la Trinité*, in *Lyon ancien et moderne*, i, 409) may be considered incomplete, the scholarly work of Charvet, *Le Collège de la Trinité* (*Mém. de la Soc. litt. etc. de Lyon*, 1874) is without doubt on a par with any of the works mentioned. M. Lanson has enlarged the list of reviews, to be sure, but we are nevertheless disappointed to find no mention there of *Modern Philology*, *Modern Language Review*, *Les Annales du Midi*, *Modern Language Publications*, etc. We hope to see this list further increased by the addition of many of the excellent provincial reviews, which are usually so hard to find.

The chapters on the first half of the sixteenth century are—and this is the general defect of bibliographical works dealing with the sixteenth century—more incomplete than those on the *Pléiade* and its successors. Under the heading, *Italie* (p. 60), for example, we fail to find the excellent articles of M. Emile Picot on *Les Français qui ont écrit en Italie au XVI^e siècle* (*Revue des Bibliothèques*, Paris, 1898) and *Les Italiens en France au XVI^e siècle* (*Bull. Italien*, 1902-03). Among the works of Charles Fontaine (p. 67), no mention is made of his *De l'antiquité et excellence de la ville de Lyon*, although it was considered worthy of a special edition in 1889 (by W. Poidebard, Lyon, 8vo).

While the *Biographie normande* and the other similar works are mentioned (p. 15), we fail to find the equally important (if not more important) *Biographie toulousaine* (1823, 2 vols.) and the *Dictionnaire historique du département de Vaucluse* (by Barjavel, Carpentras, 1841). The author has also failed to note in the bibliography of M.-C. de Buttet (p. 167) the very valuable work of M. Mugnier, *M.-C. de Buttet* (Paris, 1896). Under the heading Pibrac (p. 171), one should certainly mention the *Catalogue des ouvrages de Guy du Faur de Pibrac* (by R. de Pibrac, Orléans, 1901, 36 pp.). Furthermore under *divers poètes* (p. 166, etc.) we find such names as Etienne Forcadet, but no mention whatever of the more important personages, such as Hugues Salel, Barthélemy Aneau, etc. On p. 205 M. Lanson has noted one work of Canappe (*Du mouvement des muscles*)¹ but has omitted other more important medical scholars.²

Under works appearing outside of France, we would like to call attention to Cary's excellent *Early French Poets* (London, 1846), Kastner's *Sources of the Sonnets of Olivier de Magny* (*Mod. Philology*, 1909), etc.—The only misprints noted are *Bibliographie lyonnaise* for *Biographie lyonnaise* (p. 16, no. 169), and 1879 for 1789 (p. 16, no. 171).

JOHN L. GERIG

Columbia University

Le Cénacle de la Muse française (1823-1827). Par LÉON SÉCHÉ. Paris, Mercure de France, 1909. xv+409 pp.

Besides editing his two reviews, the *Annales romantiques* and the *Revue de la Renaissance*, M. Séché frequently finds the time to publish a volume on one of the two periods of French literature—the Sixteenth Century and the period of Romanticism—in which he is especially interested. It is very fortunate that we have a scholar who knows thoroughly these two great epochs in French literature, for there are many points of resemblance between them. De Musset was not only related to Du Bellay in blood, but also in spirit and inspiration. And to the Pléiade may be compared the seven founders of the *Muse française*.³

M. Séché admires the great period of Romanticism—the period of the Catholic and royalistic influence of Châteaubriand as contrasted with the liberal influence of Rousseau that manifested itself later. No better representatives of the first period can be found than Alexandre Soumet, Alexandre Guiraud and their protectress Sophie Gay, Jules Rességuier and Emile Deschamps, whose correspondence is published for the first time by M. Séché.

Besides this, we have brief studies devoted to the work published in the *Muse française* by the seven founders and twelve collaborators of that review. The interest in these chapters is heightened by the enthusiasm of the author,

¹ For bibliography of Canappe, cf. *Collège de la Trinité avant 1540, Rev. de la Renaissance*, 1908, pp. 89 ff.

² Cf., for example, *Pierre Tolet* in Bregnot du Lut's *Mélanges*, I, 187.

And under the *Langue française au XVI^e siècle*, we look in vain for Brandon's *Robert Estienne et le Dictionnaire français au XVI^e siècle*, Furst, Baltimore, 1904.

³ M. Séché shows other points of resemblance on p. 175, etc.

which, perhaps, is slightly exaggerated at times. M. Séché's researches on the history of the *Salon de l'Arsenal*, la *Société royale des bonnes lettres*, and les *premiers salons romantiques* are not only exceedingly interesting but very important for the history of romanticism. The volume concludes with studies on the *débuts* of Romanticism at the *Théâtre Français*, etc.

JOHN L. GERIG

Columbia University

The Life and Works of Christóbal Suárez de Figueroa. By J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, Series in Romantic Languages and Literatures, No. 1. Philadelphia, Pa., 1907. 8vo, pp. 159.

Dr. Crawford's dissertation is a credit to himself and to his university, whether the work be examined from the standpoint of content, or from that of mere form. Great care has evidently been taken with the minute details of bookmaking, a thing in which many dissertations are sorely lacking. The type is clear, the lines are well spaced, and the paper is of good shade and unglazed, with the result that the page makes an attractive appearance; while the running title serves as a convenient analysis of the book. In addition to the table of contents at the beginning, there is at the end a three-page index of proper names. There is no list of *addenda et corrigenda*, for the very good reason that, so far as I have noted, none is needed. Attention is called to these facts because too frequently an otherwise meritorious dissertation is marred by carelessness concerning matters of style and bookmaking; and also because one of the chief advantages aimed at by those few universities which require the printing of the doctoral dissertation before the conferring of the degree is precisely that of practical experience in the art of bookmaking to the extent of putting one book through the whole process from the moment of its conception to that of its being placed upon the shelves of the bookseller. Dr. Crawford has thoroughly learned this branch of the art.

With this brief tribute to the excellent form of Dr. Crawford's book we may now turn to the content, which is even more admirable. The author has placed vividly before us a character cast in a mould that certainly does not seem to have served for many of his contemporaries: an individual whose impetuosity, lack of affection, irascibility, vindictiveness, and malignity were incongruously yoked with a devotion to morality, duty, and the truth that remained unaltered in the midst of the most adverse circumstances; and even in those parlous times few men had more downs and fewer ups of fortune than had the subject of this dissertation. And yet, although Figueroa is shown to have played no inconsiderable rôle in the history of his times, and although it is maintained that his works have not received all the attention due them, Dr. Crawford has not lost his sense of proportion and does not claim that Figueroa should be enthroned among the really great authors of his epoch. In short, Dr. Crawford's statement of his author's achievement is a model of sanity and justice.

In a book that is so good throughout, it is not easy to say which parts are best. After considerable deliberation, however, I believe that most readers will agree that chapters III, V, and VII may fairly claim that honor, and among

themselves they make a *crescendo* of excellence and interest. The third chapter treats of the pastoral romance *La Constante Amarilis*, and not only proves it to be a *roman à clef*, but gives us the key, and an extremely interesting one it is. In the fifth chapter Dr. Crawford deals with three principal topics: *El Passagero*; Opposition to the National Theatre; and Relations with Alarcón and Cervantes. The combination is skilful, for it exhibits in rapid succession several sides of Figueroa's character. We see him as the personification of ingratitude and heartlessness; we see him as defender of the classical drama and opponent of the new drama; and, finally, as a ruthless critic of immorality of all kinds, wherever found in the society of his day. Figueroa's *Passagero* will always rank as a very important document for the cultural history of Spain in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Of prime importance from the same standpoint is Dr. Crawford's chapter seven, with its account of Figueroa's troubles with the Inquisition. Here we are dealing with no one man's opinion or point of view. The affair made history, the question at issue being frankly this: Is the Inquisition (and the Pope made common cause with the Inquisitors) or the Sovereign of Spain in supreme control of the latter's officers? and Dr. Crawford was thoughtful enough not to refer us to inaccessible archives, but to quote the original records in full. The solid documentation contained in the fifty-seven pages of the appendix will prove to be not the least valuable part of a very interesting and instructive book.

JOHN D. FITZ-GERALD

University of Illinois

La lingua rustica padovana nei due poeti G. B. Maganza e Domenico Pittarini, con cenni su alcuni dialetti morti e vivi e proverbi veneti. Di C. PASQUALIGO, 2d ed. Verona, Lib. Dante, 1908. Price, L. 2.

This book, which has received favorable notice elsewhere, is conducted in a semi-popular vein, but with much novelty of material and evidence of extensive erudition. It considers the development in Venetia of the Germanic speech islands and the Ladin undercurrent of dialect elements, treated so brilliantly by Ascoli in *Archiv. Glott.*, I; it compares the dialects of Verona and Lonigo; discusses foreign influences in the dialects of the XVth century; the origin of the *macaronese*, in criticism of Zannoni; finally the diffusion and character of the *lingua pavana*, in connection with Maganza, Rapa and others. Of special richness is the collection of proverbs, a field in which the name Pasqualigo is of course associated permanently with those of Bianchi and Musatti if not of Pitrè.

Considered absolutely from the scientific point of view, the book invites some criticism. The history of the dialectal development in Venetia is much vaguer than necessary in view of publications by Lazzarini, Ascoli and others. The relation of Verona to the Ladin districts is surely demonstrable by arguments of phonology and lexicography, as well as by the probabilities of climate and commercial intercourse. A third column in the parallels of pp. 4-6 would have been illuminating and easy to compile. There is something medieval about the facility with which the author admits foreign influences in explanation of deeply rooted popular forms (pp. 8-9 and 98-99): "Ripercorrendo le comedie del Ruzzante, osservai che anche là dove la scena è a Venezia e parlano

veneziani, si trova assai di rado il *xe*. Questo *xe* è il francese *c'est*, usato a Venezia dopo le Crociate quando i veneziani erano stati lungamente a contatto coi Franchi, e quando erano a Venezia letti i libri francesi e provenzali, diffusi per tutta Europa." This does not require refutation, even if we take no account of the fundamental treatment of *xe* by Gartner in the *Zeitschrift für rom. phil.*, for 1907, which seems to have escaped the author. The conditions under which linguistic hybridism is a certainty are limited in scope. How easily it may be overworked was shown in Ascoli's reply to Mussafia's discoveries of 1864. A very suggestive excerpt from Ruzzante of the Venetian dialect spoken by a Greek appears on p. 99. The rôle of the Greeks in Venetian satire is a theme well worthy of extensive investigation, and presents features notably different from the views of the French chroniclers of the Middle Ages. In one aspect at least, they have added to the avarice and deceit which enraged the Crusaders a certain seductive charm not without its effect on Venetian ladies. I may add that a patrician *secentista*, Zuanne Garzoni (di Marino), a grandnephew of Torquato Tasso, has a poem (*No giera mo peccao*) in complaint to his Nina, who has forsaken him for "quel Morè maledito." His rival's language is mimicked with some humor:

"Come custi parlava—El grego gacciolava
Digando strambamente con sti tiri:
—Viva in Candia con mi—Vorrèu vegniri
E te vorrèu sposari—E subito comprari
Una ghelera bella e di manigna,
E spender mi vorrèu cento cecchigna."¹

Here the second person plural appears as first singular; the changes of *e* to *i*, *i* to *a*, *n* to *gn*, etc., are obvious.

We must await with interest the publication of a critique on the language of Marin Sanudo, which M. Pasqualigo has prepared but holds in reserve. It contains "alcune centinaia di voci, che ora non si usano più." This completes a great gap in the accessible sources for the Venetian dialect, rich for the old and the modern, but scattered for the intermediate periods. Meanwhile the form *trozo*, "giro, rigiro" (p. 6), derived by M. Pasqualigo from *terrere*, *tritum* arouses interest. We have also the It. *trozza* (Fr. *radage*, Eng. *parral*) the circle of rope which holds the boom to the mast of a ship; and It. *trozzo*, "gentaglia," Eng. "gang of men." The latter is explainable as a deverbal from a *trozzare*, if we do not adopt Pianigiani's assumption of borrowing from Fr. *trousse*. While *thyrsus* has been generally preferred to a derivative from *torquere* as the origin of these words, no account has been taken of the Greek *τόξον*, "little wheel"; the form *trochus* "hoop" existed already in classic Latin. The semantic relation of these words, "wheel, circle, encircle, ring," etc., should offer no difficulty; and the form cited by M. Pasqualigo seems to preclude the influence of Spanish *troza* adduced by Pianigiani. The treatment of the vowel in French presents objection to our theory, unless we consider it a borrowing from Italy. Phonetic evidence in Italy would imply its introduction from the Adriatic trade.

M. Pasqualigo's insistence on the rôle of the universities in the development

¹ Cod. Querini-Stampalia, Venice, Cl. VI, cod. XX.

of the *maccheronea* has great plausibility.—Pp. 19 ff. treat some interesting parodies and translations of Petrarch, Anacreon, etc.

A. A. LIVINGSTON

Columbia University

La poesia di Venezia. Di ARNALDO SEGARIZZI. Venezia, Giov. Fabris di Spiridione, 1909. 4to. Price, L. 7.

As a scholarly work this book has value from its contribution to Venetian bibliography and as a summary of the themes and forms adopted by the poetry which Venice as a place of beauty, a seat of Italian independence, a hated political power, has inspired. The bulk of this literature is enormous; and as a mass, it has the defect of endless repetition and consistent mediocrity. This publication remedies these defects: it treats the themes progressively and every selection presents something new. Picturesqueness and tone seem to have been the criteria of choice; so that the anthology has at once freshness and unity. Taken in conjunction with the historical treatise of this poetry by Medin, the book makes accessible all that is essential to our control of this field. As a piece of book-making, it is a notable success; the illustrations are in half tone on pasters, and unique in subject; the type, slightly adorned with an inconspicuous line decoration, is large and clear, on unglazed paper. There are explanatory and bibliographical notes at the end, balancing a brief historical preface. A more detailed review, treating the content and matters of text constitution, will appear in *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

A. A. L.

Storia della Grammatica Italiana. Di CIBO TRABALZA. Milano, Hoepli, 1908. xvi + 561 pp. Price, L. 9.

In one of the most far-reaching social questions that have confronted Italy, and on which nearly everyone has had something if not too much to say, this book is, in point of critical study, the most comprehensive and organic. It not only reviews previous effort in this vast field, but adds solid contributions of hitherto unconsidered documents. And while already noteworthy reservations must be made on some of the passages in this great work, and while additional documents must be taken account of, this history will be for some time the point of departure for all studies on the question of the Italian language, on the history of grammatical categories, on the theory of grammar as an æsthetic, dogmatical or practical entity. The publication of Villey on the sources of Du Bellay's *Défense* was too late to be considered in the author's treatment of Du Bellay's relation to the *Cesano* of Tolomei (pp. 151-4), and Trabalza's *Storia* was apparently inaccessible to Grace Norton in her review of Villey (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1909, pp. 191-2). These *rapprochements* serve to show the singular universality of the philological interest in the sixteenth century and the close relation of the various expressions of it throughout Europe. It may be of interest to associate with Mr. Trabalza's treatment of foreign critics of the Italian language, the *World of Words* of John Florio, a classicist evidently in tone, but whose environment gave his dictionary a necessarily broader and more cosmopolitan scope. The complete edition of Beni's *Anticrusca* (Trabalza, pp. 296-8) was never published, but America is so fortunate as to possess the entire manuscript in the Petrarch collection at Cornell. On these details articles will shortly be forthcoming in this *Review*.

A. A. L.

BRIEF REPORT ON AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO ROMANCE SCHOLARSHIP FOR 1909

SUBJECTS GENERAL AND COMPARATIVE

E. H. Tuttle: *Notes on the Foreign elements in Roumanian*, *Mod. Phil.* VII, 1, 23-5: sees Slavic influence in the numerals, the supine and the palatal *ŝt*.—E. P. Hammond: *Danse Macabre*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1909, 63: a Laurentius Machabre was living in 1419; cf. however, *Giorn. Stor. della lett. ital.*, LIII, 463.—E. H. Tuttle: *A note on Spanish orthography*, *ibid.*, 96: the distinction in capitalization between *un enfant grec* and *les Grecs* has been abandoned in Spanish wisely.—Likewise, we may add, by most Italians; here the noun *Franchi* is still normally capitalized, probably to distinguish it from *franchi* "lire."

R. E. Moritz: *On a quantitative relation governing certain linguistic phenomena*; *ibid.*, 234-41: read rather "stylistic"? Attempts to deduce a mathematical formula by which individuality of style may be detected from observation of simple sentence percentage and from the average per sentence of predicates.—B. P. Kurtz, *Style and Habit*, a note, *ibid.*, 11-3.

G. L. Hamilton: review of N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*, *ibid.*, 16-21: an essential contribution to the subject.—K. Young, *Some texts of liturgical plays*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, XXIV, 294-331: unedited Latin texts of dramatic liturgical offices from France, Spain and Italy (twelfth to fifteenth centuries).—D. S. Blondheim, *A parallel to Aucassin et Nicolette*, VI, 26, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 73-4; treats the anecdote of Machiavelli's preference of hell to heaven.—W. G. Howard, *Ut pictura poesis*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 40-123: an excellent review of the history of this question from Alberti (1436) to De Piles, Coypel and contemporaries of Lessing in France.—A. E. Richards, *The English Wagner Book of 1894*, *ibid.*, 32-9: reference to the influence of Ariosto and to Rabelais.—L. E. Kastner, *The sources of Olivier de Magny's sonnets*, *Mod. Phil.*, 27-48: shows that he borrowed freely from Petrarch, Castellani, Tomitano, Bertussi, Sannazaro, Tebaldeo, Tasso, Ariosto, Bembo, Filosseno, etc.—J. M. Berdan: *A definition of Petrarchismo*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 699-710: distinguishes the real admirers, translators and imitators of Petrarch from those who adopted the mannerisms of the Italian cinquecentisti. Categories of Petrarchistic imitations.—W. H. Hulme, *A Middle English addition to the waver cycle*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 218-22; for the history of the novella, Boccaccio, Rueda, etc.—C. Ruutz-Rees, *Some debts of Samuel Daniel to Du Bellay*, *ibid.*, 134-7; contribution to the history of Petrarchism.—W. P. Mustard, *Notes on the eglogues of Alexander Barclay*, *ibid.*, 8-10: parallels with Mantovano and Jean le Maire de Belges.—H. F. Schwartz, *One of the sources of the Queen of Corinth*, *ibid.*, 76-7: the tale in Fletcher, Massinger and Field derives from Wynkyn de Worde's version of the *Gesta Romanorum*.—R. M. Cushman, *Concerning Fulke*

Greville's (*Lord Brooke's*) *Tragedies: Alaham and Mustapha*, *ibid.*, 180-1: concerns Paolo Giovio, De Thou, Thomas Artus, Madeleine de Scudéry, Augier Ghislain de Busbecq.—E. O. Eckelmann, *Maria Stuart im Drama der Weltliteratur*, review of K. Kipka, *Jour. of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, VIII, 3, 439-42: considers dramas on Mary Stuart in France, Italy and Spain.—P. S. Allen, *Medieval Latin lyrics*, Pt. IV, *Mod. Phil.*, 385-406: conclusion of an important series of articles on this question. Offers here general considerations of method: the earlier or better text is not always a good chronological test; vernacular phrases are not necessarily an indication of linguistic origin; nor are allusions to countries proof of the original home. Discusses the relation of versification to authorship; the nature-sense; the meaning of *goliard*, *literati* and *laici*; rhymed letters and laudatory odes. Disagrees with Bédier as to the lack of German influence on French fabliaux. Bibliography, notes and corrections.—W. P. Mustard, *Later echoes of the Greek bucolic poets*, *Am. Journ. of Phil.*, 245-83: a very comprehensive list of translations and imitations of Theocritus, Bion and Moschus in Italy, France and Spain from the Renaissance to the present day. No mention is made of the *Bucolicorum Autores*, Oporin, Bâle, 1546, at present a very rare work.

FRENCH

J. E. Matzke: *On the history of palatal ñ in French with special reference to o and open e*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 476-93: contends that the same conclusions arrived at for *a* and *e* with *ñ* apply also to the other vowels (*Mod. Lang. Pub.*, XXI, 668 ff.).—L. R. Gibbs: *The meaning of Feeldes in Chaucer's Knight's Tale*, 975-7, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 197-8: cites the analogy of Chretien de Troyes, *si reluisent tuit li pré*, with others from the *Roland* and from Froissart to prove the meaning "fields."—A. T. Bödtker: *French words in English after 1066*, *ibid.*, 214-7.

W. A. Nitze: *The Fisher King in the Grail romances*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 365-418: the Fisher King is not Christian, but a symbol of the creative force in nature (*i. e.*, water or moisture); the impulse to myth in the Arthurian romance is the primitive struggle of man to control the natural forces.—Louise Dudley: *An early homily on the Body and Soul theme*, *Journ. of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 225-53: shows the relation between the homily and the *Visio Fulberti* (ed. du Méril) and the O. Fr. *Samedi* (cf. *Romania*, XX, 518 ff.).—G. C. Keidel: *The history of French Fable manuscripts*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 207-19: describes fourteen collections in forty-nine mss.—M. P. Brush: *Ysopet III of Paris*, *ibid.*, 494-546, introduction and text.—T. Frank, *Classical scholarship in Medieval Iceland*, *Am. Journ. of Phil.*, 139-152: influence of Alexandre de Ville-dieu, Evrard de Béthune, etc., and of the French Alexander romances.—H. A. Todd: *A recently discovered fragment of an O. F. MS. of the Faits des Romains*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 676-86, recovered from the binding of a book of the fifteenth century; contains no special variants from texts already known.—S. L. Galpin: *Fortune's wheel in the Roman de la Rose*, *ibid.*, 332-42: the wheel revolves on a horizontal plane.—J. H. Hanford: *A note on the Scheirer Rhythmus*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 74-6: imitated from the *Dialogus fidei et rationis* of Philippe de Grève.—G. H. Gerould: *An early analogue of Chaucer's Prioresses Tale*, *ibid.*, 132-3: in Gregory of Tours.—W. O. Sypherd: *Le Songe Vert, and Chaucer's Dream poems*, *ibid.*, 46-7: cf. *Romania*, XXXIII, 490 ff.—G. L. Kit-

tredge: *Chaucer's Envoy to Bukton*, *ibid.*, 14-5: largely on the satire against marriage in the poetry of Eustache Deschamps.—R. K. Root: *Chaucer's Legend of Medea*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 124-53: relation to the *Roman de la Rose* and the work of Guido delle Colonne.—H. C. Goddard: *Chaucer's Legend of Good Women*, *Journ. of Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, 47-111: contends that Chaucer is far from following closely his French models.—W. H. Schofield: *Symbolism, allegory and autobiography in the Pearl*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 585-675: relation of the *Pearl* to O. Fr. lapidaries.—J. M. Manly: *The authorship of Piers the Plowman*, *Mod. Phil.*, 83-144: its author shows evidence of acquaintance with French and Latin sources.—H. N. MacCracken: *An unknown Middle English translation of the Épître d'Othea*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 122-3: by an Anthony Babynton of the poem by Christine de Pisan.—D. H. Carnahan: *Jean D'Abundance, a study of his life and three of his works*, *University Studies* (Univ. of Illinois), III, no. 5, pp. 132.—J. L. Gerig: *The family of Maurice Scève*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 470-5.—H. C. Lancaster, *A poem addressed to Alexandre Hardy*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 170-2.—D. C. Croissant: *Cibber's Cinna's Conspiracy*, *ibid.*, 256: proves that Cibber was paid for the play of which his authorship had been questioned by Miss Canfield in her *Corneille and Racine in England*.—R. M. Alden: *The development of the use of prose in the English drama, 1600-1800*, *Mod. Phil.*, 1-23: considers the efforts of La Motte, Voltaire and Diderot to introduce prose into tragedy.—S. G. Patterson: *Voltaire and Dumas*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 63: compares a passage in the *Ingénu* with the prison scene in *Monte Cristo*.—H. W. Thayer: *Thümmel's Reise and Laurence Sterne*, *ibid.*, 6-8: the German is imitated from the English text, but has felt markedly the influence of Rousseau.—J. P. Hoskins, *Biological analogy in literary criticism*, *Mod. Phil.*, 61-82: in criticism of Brunetière.—F. L. Critchlow, *Arthur in Old French poetry not of the Breton Cycle*, *Mod. Phil.*, 477-86.—Louise B. Morgan, *The source of the fountain story in the Ywain*, *Mod. Phil.*, 331-41: from the medieval fountain-lore, there are two classes of stories, one classical and, contrary to Prof. Nitze's contention (*Mod. Phil.*, III, 267-81), bearing no resemblance to Chrestien's story; and the other, containing every feature of his story, being most probably Celtic.—*Chevalerie Vivien. Facsimile Reproduction of the Sancti Bertini Manuscript of the Bibliothèque Municipale of Boulogne-sur-Mer. With an Introduction by Raymond Weeks*, Ph.D., Professor of the Romance Languages and Literature in Columbia University, New York, published in the *University of Missouri Studies*, Columbia, Missouri, 1909. The twenty-four superb plates of this publication will make it of singular value to students of paleography. The plates were executed by Berthaud Frères of Paris, and are done in the finest form of this well-known house. The Introduction contains an appreciation of the version of the *Chevalerie* as preserved in the MS. of Boulogne.—A. A. Kern, *Deschamps' Thuireval*, *Mod. Phil.*, 503-9: identifies the Thuireval mentioned in Deschamps' ballad, *The leaf and the flower*, with the English knight, John Thirlewall or Thirlwall.—F. B. Luquiens, *The Reconstruction of the original Chanson de Roland*, *Transactions of the Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, 111-136; *do.*, *Old Fr. Phonology*, Yale Press.

ITALIAN

F. M. Warren: *Tristan on the continent before 1066*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 37-8: an individual named Tristan, or Trostan appears among the Sicilian Normans in the eleventh century, as proved by documents of the twelfth. There is no evidence of connection with the Tristan of the romances.—O. M. Johnston: *Use of suo for loro in old Italian*, *ibid.*, 133-4: in correction of Bertoni, *Zeit. für R. P.*, XXXI, 495. We may add that the vitality of *suo* "loro" is due in part to its frequent analytic sense, "each his own": "un di loro che han ivi il suo soggiorno."—A. A. Livingston: *Venetian businello* = *Italian emissario*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 176-8: on the Businello del Sile.

J. B. Fletcher: *The oracle of love in the twelfth chapter of the Vita Nova*, *Nation*, 595-6: "ego sum tamquam centrum circuli, etc." associated with *Par. XXI*, 79 and *XXIII*, 94, etc.: True love is a centre of impartial, unselfish glory, reflecting equally upon all; Dante could not attain to this perfection till he had stripped his love of selfish elements.—This seems to be the import of Cochin's note in his recent translation of the *V. N.*; but Mr. Fletcher's exegesis is more profound.—W. K. Vance: *Dante in America*, *ibid.*, 253: on George Ticknor's studies in Germany and Italy, 1807-31. Most of Mr. V.'s material is developed at greater length by Koch (*Dante in America*, *Report of Dante Society*, 1896, 18-23), whom Mr. V. fails to cite. Koch does not mention the work with De Crollis in Rome, but continues Ticknor's studies to a much later period than Mr. V.—H. N. MacCracken: *Dante in English, a solution*, *ibid.*, 276-7: the reference in Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* is not to a translation of Dante by Chaucer but to Chaucer as an English Dante.—E. H. Wilkins: *Criseida*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 65-7: *Cri-* not *Gri-*; the sources of the confusion between Briseis and Criseis in Boccaccio.—C. R. Baskerville: *Sources of How a man may choose a good wife from a bad*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 711-30; in Riche's translation of Cinthio's *Hecatombi*, III, 5.—S. P. Sherman: *Stella and the Broken Heart*, *ibid.*, 274-85: rejects the theory that Ford borrowed from Italian sources.—A. A. Livingston: *Some Italian satiric predicates of the eighteenth century*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 105-8: book titles, etc., turned to satire on their authors: cf., for a similar device *The lecturing candidate*, *New York Evening Sun*, Aug. 19, 1909; for similar parlor compilations, D'Annunzio, *Il Piacere* (ed. 1896), p. 43; for predicates on nations, *Jahrbuch für Rom. und Eng. Lit.*, IX, 198; for note 10: add II, 593-4.—M. Levi, *Silence and solitude in the poems of Leopardi*, *ibid.*, 172-6.—A. A. Livingston: *A Carducci-Leopardi parallel*, *ibid.*, 243-4; *Juvenilia*, XVIII, *E tu venuto ai bell'anni ridenti*, and the ode *Sopra un basso rilievo antico sepolcrale*.—W. R. Thayer: *Jessie White Mario*, *Nation*, 564-6: biographical note.—A. S. Cook, *Six Notes*, *Mod. Phil.*, 469-76: concerns Petrarch's *Ode to the Princes of Italy*; and Dante, *Inf.*, XIII, 64-6.

SPANISH

K. Pietsch: *Spanish Etymologies*, *Mod. Phil.*, 49-60: *anviso* < **ante visu*; *saber de coro*: haplogy for *saber de *decoro*; **decoro* < *decorar* < *de cuer* (*cor*), *Fr. par coeur*. *Duecho* < *ductu* due to Leonese Asturian influence, where, besides vulgar forms, are found some with unwarranted diphthong *ie* and *ue*.—K. Pietsch: *Notes on Baist*, *Grammatik der Spanischen Sprache*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 163-6.—E. H. Tuttle: *Eng. rasher* < *Span. raja*, *ibid.*, 62-3.

C. C. Marden: *El libro de los gatos* (ed. Northup), *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 56-8.—H. R. Lang: *Communications from Spanish Cancioneros*, *Transactions of the Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, July reprint from, 73-108, 1909. The works of Juan de Valtierra, first half of fifteenth century; ten *cançiones* with linguistic notes; account of the Seville ms. of the *Cancionero de la Colombina*.—G. G. Laubscher: *Notes on the Spanish Ysopo of 1496*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 70-1: cf. *Romania*, XXIII, 561-75 and H. R. Lang, *Ysopete in Spanish*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 158, reference in Juan Ruiz.—J. P. W. Crawford: *A Spanish farce of the early sixteenth century*, *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, 1-31: by Luis Margarit, 1519-22.—K. Pietsch, *Don Quixote I, Prologo, Non bene pro toto libertas venditur auro*, *ibid.*, 55-6.—G. T. Northup, *An allusion in Lope de Vega*, *ibid.*, 62, in *Comedias* (Hartzenbusch, Madrid, 1859), to the Osoric libels, in the "infame rama del linaje Osorio."—M. A. Buchanan: *Chorley's Catalogue of Comedias and Autos of Frey Lope Felix de Vega Carpio*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 167-70; extensive correction to Rennert's *Life of L. de V.*—A. H. Bushee: *The Spanish Novel*, *ibid.*, 127-8: on Rodriguez Marin's *Mateo Aleman*.—W. W. Comfort, *The Moors in Spanish popular poetry before 1600*, reprint from *Haverford Essays*, Haverford, Pa., 1909, 273-303.—M. A. Buchanan, *La Vida Es Sueño, comedia famosa de D. Pedro Calderon de la Barca*, University of Toronto Library, 1909, Vol. I, pp. 135. Critical text with notes. An important contribution, to be noticed later in this *Review*.

NOTES AND NEWS

Both of the editors of this REVIEW are advocates of the movement for the simplification of English spelling. Within appropriate limits, contributors will be freely permitted to follow their individual predilections in the matter.

The twenty-seventh annual meeting of the Modern Language Association was held at Cornell University, on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, the 28th, 29th and 30th of December. The meeting was well attended, and was pronounced a success by the faithful who had attended many such occasions. The Romance papers were in evidence, and showed careful preparation. The increasing activity of Romance scholarship, as evinced in the *Publications*, was publicly mentioned. The following officers were elected: President, Brander Matthews, of Columbia University; 1st Vice-President, J. W. Cunliffe, University of Wisconsin; 2d Vice-President, J. D. M. Ford, Harvard University; 3d Vice-President, A. B. Faust, Cornell University. The next meeting will be held in New York City.

Similarly, all reports announce that the meeting of the Central Division, at the University of Iowa, was successful and inspiring. The Central Division chose as Chairman Professor Laurence Fossler, of the University of Nebraska. The next meeting of the division will be at St. Louis, where was held, in December, 1896, the second annual meeting of this body. A joint meeting with the Eastern Division is due in 1911. In both divisions, there are committees working on revised lists of texts for the study of modern languages.

Professor Bédier, of the Collège de France, sailed for home at Christmas-tide, and arrived safely. He came under the auspices of the *Alliance Française*, to conduct a series of lessons such as he gives at the *Collège de France*. These lessons were meant to be rigorously scientific, and to resemble as little as possible the conventional public lecture. The subject-matter concerned the period of Old French, and largely, but not solely, the epic literature. The lessons of Professor Bédier produced an admirable and, let us hope, lasting impression of what constitutes the finest qualities of French scholarship and character. Professor Bédier delivered a series of his lessons at the following universities: Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Chicago, Illinois; also one or two lessons at Vassar, and at the universities of Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Michigan. He represented the *Collège de France* at the installation of President Lowell of Harvard, and received the honorary doctorate from that university.

Professor Lucien Foulet, of the University of California, is spending half a year in France. His address will be Care of the Crédit Lyonnais, Paris.

Professor H. Suchier announces an edition of the *Chanson de Guillaume*. It is dedicated to Joseph Bédier.

Professor Charles H. Grandgent, of Harvard University, has been spending a part of his sabbatical year in southern France, at Le Cannet. He is at present traveling in Italy. His address is Care of Baring Bros., London.

Professor M. Levi, of the University of Michigan, is spending the year in France. His address is 5 rue Cassini, Paris.

Under the title: *Li Contes del Graal, Crestien's von Troyes Contes del Graal (Percevaus li galois)*, an edition of the valuable manuscript, Paris, fonds français 794, has appeared, without date or indication of printer or of place. It is said to have been issued privately for the pupils of Professor Baist, at Freiburg im Breisgau. We are sorry not to be able to indicate a book-dealer from whom a copy of this rare volume might possibly be obtained.

Professor A. Cohn, head of the department of Romance languages at Columbia University, has gone to France to remain until August. His address is Care of Munroe & Co., 7 rue Scribe, Paris.

Professor C. C. Ayer, of the University of Colorado, intends to spend next year in foreign travel and study.

Mr. A. A. Livingston, of Columbia University, has accepted an appointment to Cornell University as Assistant Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures. He will also edit the catalog and subject index of the admirable Petrarch collection of that university.

Mr. S. G. Patterson is spending the year in Europe as Cornell fellow in Romance Languages.

Mr. J. A. Ray, formerly of Annapolis, is in Arabia in the consular service.

Professor Walter Morris Hart, of the University of California, whose work interests Romance scholars by so many side-lights, is spending the year in Europe. His address is Care of the Crédit Lyonnais, Paris.

Professor John D. Fitz-Gerald, of the University of Illinois, has been commissioned by the Spanish Royal Academy to prepare a critical edition of the *Celestina*. The edition will appear in the official series of masterpieces.

Dr. Aurelio M. Espinosa is said to have been offered an assistant professorship in the department of Romanic Languages at the Leland Stanford University. Professor Espinosa obtained his A.B. and his A.M. at the University of Colorado in 1902 and 1904, and later his doctor's degree from the University of Chicago. His publications are well known.
